

19016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 10, 1965

low an ebb as respect for the law in Mississippi these days.

Representative Reuss, who flew to Mississippi from economic discussions in England as soon as he heard of his son's arrest, made it clear that his trip was not intended "to procure special treatment for him. I am sure he will want to take his chances along with other civil rights workers." The sentiment does honor alike to father and son; but one can hardly escape anxiety regarding the chances of civil rights workers in Mississippi these days.

Mississippians ought to recognize the sentiment which sent Michael Reuss to their State and which prompts him to remain there in spite of peril. It is a sentiment which has ennobled the history of Mississippi as it has ennobled the history of the Nation of which Mississippi is a part. It has its roots in a sense of responsibility for one's fellow men—the indispensable condition of democracy—and in an unwillingness to be pushed around or to see other people pushed around. Mississippians ought to understand this. The motto of their State is: "By Valor and Arms." Michael Reuss is helping to carry that motto into effect for them.

U.S. SOLDIER CAN DO THE JOB IN VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a common illusion in this country is that the American soldier just is not up to the tough, guerrilla jungle fighting required in South Vietnam.

In a surprising and mighty encouraging article in this respect, Jack Raymond, the crack Pentagon correspondent of the New York Times, puts this stereotype to rest.

Mr. Raymond recently returned from a trip to Vietnam in which he had the chance to see the job the GI's and the Vietcong are doing out there. His conclusions on the vigorous way American troops are standing up could mean a great deal.

In spite of all the immensely powerful and sophisticated military developments of recent years, it is still true that in war—especially this kind of guerrilla war, much depends on the courage, strength, intelligence, and discipline of the individual fighting man.

Considering all that has been written about the softening effects of American life, and the alleged disinterest or downright hostility toward our efforts by some American critics. This article makes reassuring reading.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "When GI Joe Meets 'Ol Charlie" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN GI JOE MEETS 'OL' CHARLIE
(By Jack Raymond)

SAIGON.—"Mostly it's listening," the young Marine Corps corporal said. "You hold yourself stock-still in the jungle and you can't see much. It's dark and there's only trees and brush thick with vines.

"But you listen. Any sound that's out of the ordinary means something. Even insect noises change. Dogs in the village make tell-tale noises, barking or yowling when something attracts their attention and they can help or hurt you, depending on who's doing the movin'. A man can't move through the jungle without making some kind of noise or provoking some bug or animal to make it for

him. Americans make noise in the jungle—but so do the Vietnamese. 'Ol' Charlie, too."

Cpl. D. G. Williams, 19, of Winchester, Ky., wiry and boyfaced even after 2½ years in the Marine Corps, sat with some of his comrades of 1st Battalion, 3d Marines in a tent on the side of a hill near Danang and told how it was to fight "Ol' Charlie," the Vietcong, in the jungle.

He told about it with the air of a man born to it, a modern Bomba the Jungle Boy. But all up and down the confused battlefronts in South Vietnam he and other American jungle warriors emphasized that nobody is a born jungle fighter—not the Americans, nor the Vietnamese, including the Vietcong.

It takes training, equipment, good health and stamina, leadership and motivation—and experience. Inevitably the question arises whether American soldiers have a capacity for jungle fighting, since many of them—in greater numbers than seemed likely only a year ago—will be called upon to cope with the jungle as the U.S. commitment in South Vietnam changes over from a supporting to a leading combatant role.

The question does not apply so much to the troops that are here now, in the vanguard of that commitment. Most of the Special Forces, paratroopers, marines, and many others who do not belong to elite outfits have been specially trained and have been acclimating themselves with distinction.

The question does apply to the tens and perhaps hundreds of thousands of American troops expected to join them in this tropical war. It concerns the adequacy of their training, equipment, and physical well-being, for as one veteran sergeant here said, "This place is no longer a laboratory for battle or a training ground for the next war. The next war is now."

The question is not posed with any suggestion of strong doubt, but only in recollection of tragic situations that developed early in World War II when men were rushed to stem the Japanese in southeast Asia and the South Pacific. In the panic atmosphere that followed Pearl Harbor entire units were shipped to do tropical battle with a minimum of training and inadequate indoctrination for special conditions of climate, weather, and terrain—and it cost lives.

Nevertheless, Americans did accustom themselves to jungle fighting. They defeated the enemy in the tropics as elsewhere, but only after initial defeats and an unnecessary toll in malaria, foot ailments, skin diseases, diarrhea, heat exhaustion, and hepatitis—not to mention such relatively modest afflictions as snake and mosquito bites.

Conditions in South Vietnam are probably not as severe as in the Philippines, Burma, and New Guinea a quarter-century ago, but time may have served to exaggerate past sufferings and existing trials may make less of an impact.

In any case, not all of South Vietnam is jungle, although a third is covered by some form of wild vegetation. In the delta region of the south the distinctive features are marshy rice fields and mangrove swamps. The southern tip, Caumau Peninsula, is dense jungle and for the time being has been hopelessly abandoned to the Vietcong.

The narrow coastal plain that curves along the China Sea is hot enough—at least over 90° most of the time—and rainy and muggy when the monsoon shifts from the highlands to the west. Marshlands lie up against the white sand beaches.

In the central highlands, where heavy fighting is taking place, there are large stands of bamboo and hardwood trees. The rolling terrain rises to 3,000 feet above sea level and some of the mountains are as high as 7,000 feet. Much of the highlands region is considered good tank-fighting country when it is dry—but it is wet now in the summer monsoon season of incessant rain and low-hanging depressing gray clouds. The ground is soft underfoot.

There are wild animals in Vietnam—elephants, tigers, and leopards as well as smaller game, including wildcats. Monkeys are found in the coastal forests. Crocodiles thrive in the delta region. There is much talk of snakes—cobras and such—but they are rarely seen.

Despite this rather forbidding prospect for the troops that are due here, the experience of those who already are serving in Vietnam is somewhat encouraging. For they have shown that an American can perform well in jungle heat and rain, and can adapt himself quickly to the terrain, as anywhere else.

For one thing the troops sent here have been well-trained volunteers. They have had rigorous training in jungle warfare or other types of hardy combat and for the most part have completed special warfare training courses at Fort Bragg or Ranger courses at Fort Benning or have had a regular diet of tough training on Okinawa or Hawaii.

Moreover, they are keeping up with their training here. For example, members of the 173d Airborne Brigade, when not combing awesome jungles of zone D on combat operations, have been practicing parachute jumping.

The emphasis on training has paid off, a high-ranking officer in Saigon said, especially since American forces have taken a more active role in the fighting. In the American officer's view, the South Vietnamese are "often timid and slow, even when we put good equipment in their hands."

"Our officers and junior officers in these outfits here know their men, know how quickly they respond to orders and how they'll react to surprise. That's as important in the jungle as it is anywhere else."

Another officer's experience is also revealing. "I've found that I can go twice as far and twice as hard as most of the South Vietnamese," Col. Bruce Jones, 47-year-old adviser in the embattled Quangnai area, told an interviewer. An Army man for 25 years, Colonel Jones is a heavy-set, lumbering six-footer from Sheffield, Pa. His aides say he shows none of the weariness under the heat and strain of war in the tropics indicated by South Vietnamese half his age.

"Most of these men are small in stature and come from families that could not afford much in the way of adequate diet," he said. "Even with afternoon rests many of them cannot keep going for more than 4 days, and you know many Americans can work every day."

Others who have lived and fought with the South Vietnamese military forces make similar observations, although they are reluctant to draw invidious comparisons. "There's just a big difference between a 105-pound Asian and a 150- to 160-pound American," a general at headquarters in Saigon pointed out.

An experienced Army sergeant who has just come off 6 months' steady duty in combat operation with a South Vietnamese outfit said:

"Somehow it seems they take longer getting started in the morning. They rise and wash and dress and have breakfast as though they had all day. They just take their time, maybe 45 minutes altogether. When we Americans might be ready in 15 to 20 minutes.

"Well, suppose we go out on patrol that morning. They'll start off smartly like any good soldiers, rifles at ready and reconnaissance men in proper places, but if it's a hot day we find they are far more vulnerable to heat than average Americans. By midmorning they seem to need a break. Most Americans judge whether we need a break by what the situation is—whether there are Vietcong in the area or whether it might be better to go somewhere else, but the Vietnamese are more prone to time themselves.

"We both find it easy to skip lunch. You don't want to eat much in hot, humid weather."

August 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19015

WALTER FRANCIS FARRELL, DISTINGUISHED CITIZEN OF RHODE ISLAND

MR. PASTORE. Mr. President, Walter Francis Farrell, distinguished citizen of Rhode Island, passed away Friday, August 6, 1965, at the age of 77 years.

It is the glory of democracy that popular government can command—without remuneration—the best brains of civil life to advise in difficult areas demanding highest skill and judgment.

Especially in its fiscal needs, its policies of taxation and expenditure, the average State and its Governor leans heavily on the banking community.

I say this both as preface and as part of my eulogy of the late Walter F. Farrell of Providence, R.I., preeminent banker, dedicated counselor in State and municipal finance, community leader, and community servant.

As one of the Rhode Island Governors who drew upon the genius of Walter Farrell, I speak the common gratitude of our people. As a personal friend through all these years I speak of the warm humanity of the man.

As an object lesson of worthy ambition to lift one's self to the heights—and yet always to find time for public service in causes of compassion and patriotism, the life story of Walter Farrell will be a memory to inspire—as it inspired all privileged to know him and his career.

If I record them here—and I shall ask unanimous consent that they may be here recorded—it is not to glorify one who is beyond praise. It is rather as a challenge—this chart of one man's life of service.

It is a challenge to youth that one's future can be fashioned by one's will, one's ambition, one's determination, and that such future can be sweetened by dedication to community service.

It is a challenge to the already successful man—that life is at its richest and fullest only when shared beyond self as the good neighbor, the good citizen, the good American.

So I make the mere recital of one man's life and labors in this half century that so many of us have shared. If it seems long, it is the measure of a full life, and each line his its own lesson. It is the newsman's view of a newsworthy life recorded in the Providence Evening Bulletin of August 7, 1965.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

W. F. FARRELL, RETIRED BANK OFFICIAL, DIES

Walter Francis Farrell, retired chairman of the board of the Industrial National Bank and an authority on municipal finance, died last night at the Hattie Ide Chaffee Home, East Providence. He was 77 years old.

Mr. Farrell had held a multitude of posts in the financial world during his banking career of a half century.

He rose from a clerk in the old Union Trust Co. in 1913 at the age of 25 to become president in 1927 of what was then the third largest bank in the State. Then only 38 years old, he was the youngest bank president in Rhode Island at that time.

When the Union Trust merged in 1951 with the Providence National Bank, Mr. Farrell became president of the combination—the

Providence Union National Bank & Trust Co. Three years later, when the Providence Union National was consolidated with the former Industrial Trust Co., Mr. Farrell became chairman of the board of the merged Industrial National Bank.

He retired as board chairman in January 1957, but continued as a director and member of the executive committee.

In his phenomenal rise in banking, his eminence as a fiscal adviser to numerous city and State agencies and his active creation of many large corporations, Mr. Farrell was largely self-taught.

He was born in Central Falls, May 11, 1888, the son of John E. and Caroline (Hale) Farrell, and with only a public school education he began his business career as an estimator for a construction firm. In 1912 he married Margaret L. McArdie and the next year became a clerk in the Union Trust Co.

There his rise was meteoric—assistant secretary shortly after he joined the bank, secretary in 1918, vice president in 1919, a director in 1923 and president in 1927.

Banking associates ascribed Mr. Farrell's rapid advancement to his eagerness to learn every facet of finance as he encountered it, his insistence upon perfection of factual detail and long hours of applications, belying the cliché of banker's hours. Until he was well into his 60's, he still worked Saturdays and most Sundays.

As an expert on municipal finance, he had served at various times as fiscal advisor to city and State governmental agencies. These included the Providence Sinking Fund Commission, the State board of sinking fund commissioners from 1927 to 1947, the public assistance reserve fund, the Governor's fiscal study commission, the advisory commission to the Rhode Island Development Council, the State committee on postwar problems in 1943, and a Governor's commission to study losses and recovery problems after the 1955 Blackstone Valley floods.

He was incorporator in 1957 and vice president of the University of Rhode Island Foundation, vice president of the Rhode Island Public Expenditures Council in 1943, financial advisor to the Providence Charter Revision Commission in 1936, chairman of the United Fund in 1944, vice president of the Providence United War Fund in World War II, treasurer of the Rhode Island Infantile Paralysis Foundation, executive board member of the Providence Community Fund, one of three trustees for the Rhode Island Tercentenary Jubilee in 1936, and a director of the Providence Governmental Research Bureau and of the Rhode Island Medical Society Physicians Service.

He had been president of the Rhode Island Bankers Association, an executive committee member of the American Bankers Association and a district member of the National Voluntary Credit Restraint Committee.

Among Mr. Farrell's corporate directorships were the Spidel Corp., Outlet Co., United Public Markets, Inc., Pauls Silk Co., Inc., of Pawtucket; the former Franklin Process Co., and its South Carolina and Tennessee units, and Pawtucket Times Publishing Co.

Mr. Farrell was appointed a member of the board of trustees of State colleges in 1955 and resigned in 1959. He was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of laws by the University of Rhode Island in January 1960.

Mr. Farrell was a member of the Turk's Head Club, University Club, Rhode Island Country Club, and Bankers of America. His home was at 560 Cole Avenue, Providence.

MICHAEL REUSS: BATTLER FOR RIGHTS AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

MR. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the son of Representative HENRY REUSS, of the Fifth District of Wisconsin, has recently been through some mighty trying experiences.

He went to Mississippi this summer to help teach Mississippi youngsters; to teach them how to read and write and what rights they now have under the civil rights bills we passed last year and this year.

Mike Reuss is quite a boy. He was an athlete and an excellent scholar at St. Albans School. He has been a guest at our home for dinner. We found him a quiet, well-mannered boy, courteous, thoughtful, a model of good behavior.

He is now a sophomore at Stanford University, and there is no question that he has as bright a future as any young American could have. Mike could have done whatever he wished with his summer vacation.

But he made a choice that is a great credit to him and to those of his generation who, with him, decided to take the risks and suffer the hot, rough work of teaching Negro children in Mississippi.

He was arrested for peaceful, nonviolent demonstration and spent some 10 days in jail several weeks ago. Then only last week he was arrested again for the same kind of protest. While he was being searched, the searching officer died of a heart attack, and for an incredible few hours Mike Reuss was charged with manslaughter.

He was of course cleared and freed. Then his lawyer and some of his associates were assaulted with shotgun fire in a little hut in retribution shortly after he was freed.

The Reuss case is big copy all over America and, of course, it is sensational copy in Mississippi. Considering everything, the continued presence of this remarkable young man in Mississippi is highly dangerous.

Yet he has decided to stay to continue his quiet work with children who need help in learning to read and write. And his father, Representative HENRY REUSS, has given his full assent.

Mr. President, this is a rare and welcome act of courage by both father and son. I proudly salute Representative HENRY REUSS, Mike Reuss, and the wonderful Reuss family. Their quiet, dignified, but persevering conduct in this regrettable matter has been a great credit to our State and our country.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial in this morning's Washington Post paying tribute to Mike Reuss be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BY VALOR AND ARMS

Young Michael Reuss' adventures as a civil rights worker trying to help Negroes vote in Mississippi make the State sound like a part of the Congo. He was arrested for taking part in a protest demonstration and then charged with manslaughter after a highway patrol investigator died of an apparent heart attack while searching him. He was released when his father, Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin, flew to his support. Then a house where his lawyer and some companion civil rights workers took shelter was made the target of a succession of shotgun blasts early Sunday morning. Respect for human life appears to be at about as

August 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19017

er. But if we do quit for a bite or a rest in the middle of the day the Aslans customarily want to take a siesta. The American may lie down but in a few minutes he will be indulging in a bit of horseplay, whereas the Aslan will simply lie down and even try for a snooze.

"If we get into a fight the Aslans can be quite heroic but unlike Americans they are inclined to let the Vietcong break off. Americans would like to chase after the Vietcong but South Vietnamese are just as likely to suggest it's useless.

"The difference in stamina really shows up on the way back, when we have reached the farthest point on patrol—maybe we have been out a day, maybe four. On the way back, the Vietnamese will begin rushing, eager to get back to base. They'll start snaking through the jungle instead of combing it. Weariness begins to show in their faces and bearing. Rifles that they held so smartly at the ready when we set out they now hold limply and sometimes—and this is dangerous in case of ambush—sometimes they sling their rifles over their shoulder.

"Much of the difference is due not only to stamina but to training and discipline. If we have had adversities—if the weather's been bad, or we have had a tangle with Vietcong—the Vietnamese patrol unit is likely to start questioning whether completion of the mission is necessary and try to cut it short. The average American noncom would be ashamed, even afraid, to report he did not carry out the mission, but these people are fully prepared to do so and explain why.

"Of course, these are generalizations. As you can imagine, many South Vietnamese have proved tough and not all Americans by any means are great jungle fighters. But by and large the old adage prevails—a good big man can outdo a good little man."

"It is a question of motivation," Capt. Larry F. Spargo, 34-year-old Special Forces officer from Twin Falls, Idaho, said, enunciating the views of many Americans. "Our troops come here for 6 months, a year, maybe 18 months if they extend and want to stay with their outfit, but these fellows [the Vietnamese] have been fighting since the French were here. They're weary."

But certainly the question arises whether the Vietcong is not tired as well, since he has been fighting for a long time, too. And attached to that question is another: whether this wily master of ambush is really a master of jungle warfare.

The answer to the latter question is a resounding "no" from American forces here. "Vietcong successes are, for the most part, a reflection of the nature of the war rather than a reflection of any innate superiority as a jungle fighter," Maj. Thomas M. Henry, operations officer for the 5th Special Forces, pointed out. "The guerrilla has time to conserve his energy. He sets the stage for battle."

The Vietcong, of course, have well-trained forces increasingly well-equipped. Their unit leadership seems to be quite adequate, despite recent reports of lowered morale due to American aerial bombing and strafing.

As such experts as Major Henry and Captain Spargo point out, the Vietcong troops can bid their time, rehearse their troops, rest them and exercise them with a single ambush or assault in mind. The Vietcong can wait weeks—perhaps months—for a single ambush if they think it profitable and thus do not tax the energies of the men. Meanwhile, the South Vietnamese and Americans are expending energy searching for them. On the other hand, the Vietcong also have their weaknesses.

"Don't overrate the enemy," urged Capt. George Squillace, a 36-year-old marine from New York City. The Aslan, and that includes the Vietcong in particular, is bothered by the heat and the jungle as much as we are—maybe worse.

"He is racked by the same ill and does not often have adequate medicine. We have been fighting them and capturing them. They make plenty of mistakes."

"We meet them on the trails," Staff Sgt. Dean Towne, 32, of Fallbrook, Calif., said. "And we move faster—we shoot faster than they do. And we find they leave sloppy trails, too—cigarette butts, fish traps and other signs of their presence.

"And they don't like to go out in the rain, either, and now they're finding out we go on night patrols and we don't meet them so often."

The American Forces seem to be satisfied with their equipment, particularly the Army jungle boot, which is made of leatherbound canvas, has a one-piece heel and sole (so the heel won't rip off) and two holes near the arch to let the water drain out after a mush through swamps and stream. Similarly other items of equipment, such as the poncho that also is used as a bed covering—the bed may be made of twigs and other underbrush—and the light cotton battle fatigues, are comfortable in hot or cool weather. Indeed, marines who arrived here with bulkier clothing, including bulletproof liners for blouses, have abandoned these for the Army's battle uniform.

The troops like their weapons. The paratroopers especially like the light M-16 rifle. The marines are satisfied with the M-1 and both the Army men and marines have found the shotgun valuable in jungle areas. They feel the heavy equipment, the M-113 personnel carrier, and the amphibious monsters are a help rather than a hindrance.

It is true that the personnel carriers and other military vehicles can be a nuisance in the paddles and jungles but they are still better than marching long stretches or carrying goods on human backs. In fact, the American soldier on patrol, with the exception of the food and radio equipment he carries, travels as light as his Asian counterpart. Furthermore, heavy as C-rations may be, they are less bulky than the rice pots carried by the Aslans. As for the radio equipment, that is indispensable; no squad moves out on patrol without a set that can be used to contact home base or friendly aircraft overhead.

In sum, it is not a question of whether Americans are loaded down, as compared with the Aslans. This is a war in which the guerrilla's advantage lies in deciding where a battle will take place. He prepares for it in secret. When he attacks he, too, has plenty of weapons and supplies. But in between he carries neither weapons nor extra supplies. He hides simply by being one of the population. Where and how he maintains his stocks has been his secret.

What is significant is not that the Americans have been hampered by equipment but that they have been able to position so much of it to support the patrols. For instance, members of the Third Marine Regiment, commanded by Col. Ed. Wheeler, of Fort Chester, N.Y., have found the "Topsy" especially valuable. This is the nickname for the ANTPS-21 (Army-Navy tactical personnel surveillance). It is a radar device effective at 20,000 meters and Colonel Wheeler's men have been using it to ambush the Vietcong ambushers.

Certainly the role of the helicopter in jungle warfare, as conducted by Americans, cannot be overlooked. Not only is the chopper used to deliver troops to patrol elites, to spray the area with rockets and machinegun bullets when the Vietcong is suspected in the vicinity, it is marvelous for the rescue of men in a tight spot.

Air Force Capt. William Y. Duggan, 30, of Austin, Tex., had reason to appreciate an Army helicopter when he was downed offshore 60 miles south of Saigon. He swam to a beach, walked in circles, even walked backward, and crawled around to confuse the Vietcong with false tracks, he later related.

Then he dug a hole and covered himself only moments before Vietcong who had seen the plane go down came looking for him. They went away. Forty-five minutes later Duggan heard a helicopter. He got out of the hole, fired a flare, and the helicopter came down and rescued him.

Still another wonderful innovation in modern war in the tropics is the air-conditioning of at least one or two rooms in buildings at base camps. The number of outposts so equipped should not be exaggerated, but enough of them, their air conditioners powered by mobile generators, can be found in some startlingly remote places. And on many air bases where fliers and ground crews are constantly exposed to sun and heat there are air-conditioned trailers and clubrooms to help make life livable.

And neither rain nor clouds nor heat nor Vietcong seem able to stay the couriers of cold beer and fresh cigarettes—"to help make a man a better junglefighter," said one officer, winking broadly. Then he added seriously: "Do not draw hasty conclusions. We overran some Vietcong villages the other day and found one of their command posts stacked with cold beer and cigarettes, too. Morale is important." Also high on the list of morale boosters is mail from home. Most letters take only 4 or 5 days from the States.

As for food, the soldiers say they even like their field rations. Gone is the old K ration. The C ration, which can be hot or cold, seems to be flavorful—"especially when the taste is killed with the cheese ration," one soldier observed more for the sake of a joke than an argument.

"The rations are good and nutritious," Captain Spargo told an interviewer who visited his detachment at Phuoc Vinh. Spargo, who is married and has three children, has been serving and fighting with a South Vietnamese detachment in jungles south of Saigon near Dongxoi, which was the scene of bloody battle last June. "But we often just eat the rice and fish of the men we are with in order to avoid envy," he said.

"And the mosquito repellent is important, too," Specialist 5 Michael Bingo, 22, of Rochester, N.Y., chimed in. "But I'll let you in on a secret," he continued. "You start sweating and get a little raunchy and the mosquitoes stop bothering you. In fact, even leeches begin to leave you alone."

All seem to agree that salt tablets taken regularly were important to the well-being of a man exerting himself in the jungle.

Apparently well equipped with material things for war in the tropics, the American soldier has personal, physical, and mental postures that also must be considered. Here again, unit training counts. But there is more to it than that.

"The average American is a pretty healthy, vigorous individual and he will think for himself," Major Henry pointed out. "The training is important because it makes the average soldier realize all he can do, even in the toughest circumstances." As an illustration he told the story of an American sergeant who was captured by Vietcong.

The Vietcong leader, overjoyed that he had netted an American along with South Vietnamese prisoners, began haranguing the sergeant. He worked himself into such a state that he turned to one of his men, who was holding the sergeant's own carbine, ordered, "Shoot him" and stalked off.

But the sergeant remembered there was no ammunition in the weapon, having fired the last bullet during the battle, so as soon as the Vietcong leader had gone the sergeant turned the other way and ran off into the jungle. He had almost disappeared before other Vietcong soldiers realized the appointed executioner was powerless and fired after the fleeing prisoner.

"The sergeant caught a slug in his bottom but that only assured he would run faster and get away," Major Henry related.

19018

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 10, 1965

Ordinary Army training, as compared with that of elite outfits such as Special Forces, Marine Corps, and certain paratroopers, does not normally focus on hardships of war in the tropics. Before troops are committed to battle in South Vietnam they should have at least 2 months' training in individual and unit techniques for operating in the steaming heat of the jungles and wet, dismal marshes of ricefields.

While most American units get some of this training, most U.S. Armed Forces are still geared to cope with the Soviet Union as the primary potential enemy and Europe as the primary battleground. But it is in the less advanced areas of the world—Asia, Africa, Latin America—where the Communist policy of so-called wars of national liberation is inviting American military responses these days.

Knowing how to build a bed off the ground, to cook without making too much smoke, to keep clean, to make one's way through the jungle with or without compass, to shoot quickly and elude ambushers will spell the difference between life and death, victory and defeat in this new war.

The troops who are here have learned to use their salt tablets, conserve their energies, interpret the sounds of the squeaking lizards and shrieking birds, and burn the leeches off their bodies.

They have learned not to fear the dark but to take advantage of it.

They have learned that small units, 10 men, with a trustworthy leader are the key battle formations of the jungle.

They have learned to eat sparingly, walk lightly, and improvise swiftly when caught in inevitable ambush.

Many of these lessons they acquired here by experience, the most effective teacher. But principles of jungle warfare must be learned in advance. The American can take it in the tropics. But he must be adequately prepared if he is to dish it out victoriously in combat.

TRIBUTE TO LAWRENCE O'BRIEN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last week an excellent column by Mr. Joseph Kraft entitled "Applause for Dr. O'Brien" appeared in the Washington Post. I believe that Larry O'Brien has been the most valued member of the White House staff in its relations with the Congress as a whole, and more especially with the Senate.

His understanding and his political judgment are of the highest. His contributions toward easing the way for proposed legislation are well understood by all. He is universally recognized as a great political scientist—and I mean that term in its best sense. He has contributed much to the passage of legislation wanted by the administrations of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. He has formed many solid and sound friendships with Members of the Congress on both sides of the aisle. He has worked with us on a basis of trust, tolerance, and understanding.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the column to which I referred by Mr. Kraft be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

APPLAUSE FOR DR. O'BRIEN

(By Joseph Kraft)

The old system is now dead, and nothing proves it better than an obscure procedural vote taken in the House last week. It in-

volved the new 21-day rule which makes it possible to call measures on to the floor if they have been bottled up for more than 3 weeks in the Rules Committee.

The measure at stake was repeal of a provision—14(b)—of the Taft-Hartley Law which authorized States to outlaw the closed shop.

Credit for this great change is normally given to the President because of his long experience with the Congress, and because of the great majorities he swept in with him last fall. And certainly no one would deny or disparage the President's role.

But the strategist of the change, the man who planned it 5 years ago, and who has worked it out day by day ever since, is the President's special assistant for congressional relations, Lawrence O'Brien. While all the political assistants all over the country were writing that hate was the normal state of relations between White House and Hill, O'Brien was already beginning to develop the possibilities of cooperation.

His chief innovation was to set up in the White House a small staff charged entirely with responsibility for congressional relations. The staff was organized along the lines of the various regional and interest groups in the Senate and House. It coordinated the congressional efforts of all Government agencies. It was in constant touch with the congressional leadership. "We don't even take a headcount," one of the leaders once said, "without O'Brien."

A first gain was a far more intimate working relationship between the administration and the little-known but extremely powerful giants in the House. As a supreme example, consider the case of the 1964 tax cut and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, WILBUR MILLS.

The administration, way back in 1962, proposed the tax cut to stimulate the economy; it was afraid that tying tax reform to the bill would kill the whole measure. MILLS, for his part, wanted a tax reform bill with a little cut added to smooth the way for reform.

Very slowly, month by month * * * the administration nursed MILLS along to its point of view. The bill that finally emerged from his committee, and that he steered through the House was almost all cut and no reform—just what Dr. O'Brien ordered.

A second gain was that the White House was in touch not only with the congressional leadership, but also with the backbenchers. The 16 Agriculture Committee Democrats who supported 14(b), for example, were not the committee leaders. On the contrary, the six who opposed the administration on 14(b) were precisely the senior members of the committee.

O'Brien is at last getting some public recognition for his achievement. Indeed, the President and his friends are showering him with compliments. An educated guess is that Mr. Johnson would like him to stick around in the White House job.

A good hunch is that O'Brien will leave to reenter Massachusetts politics. If nothing else the time is ripe for leavetaking. A way, a permanent way I believe, to promote cooperation between the Executive and the Congress has been worked out.

From now on * * * the big problem—the second phase of the Johnson administration and the true opportunity for the Republicans—will turn on the matter of applying effectively the measures that are already on the books.

DISASSEMBLEMENT OF MALAYSIAN FEDERATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is most unfortunate that the Malaysian

Federation which was launched with so much hope so short a time ago is now being disassembled. The principal difficulties apparently involve the heritage of suspicion and mistrust between Singapore Chinese and Malaysians. But there have also been other strains from the beginning of the Federation in the relationships of the indigenous peoples of Brunei, Sarawak, and North Borneo and the mainland Malaysians which have been exploited by Indonesia. It is not possible at this time to determine whether the present breakup will extend to these other areas as well as Singapore.

This Nation has had very satisfactory treatment of its limited commercial and other interests both in Malaya and in Singapore. It has not been involved in the political difficulties of either place in any way and discretion would certainly indicate that we ought to seek by every means—including and especially complete noninvolvement in the present political difficulties—to maintain these relations.

What eventually emerges in the way of relationships in the Malaysian region is the primary responsibility of the political leaders of Kuala Lumpur and Singapore, and those in the outlying island-components. Both the Tinko Abdul Rahman in the former city and Premier Lee Kuan Yew in Singapore are men of exceptional ability and it is to be hoped that they will be able to work through the present difficulties to a new and satisfactory association. To the extent that any outside nation is involved intimately in this situation, however, that nation is not the United States. In our own interests as well as in the interests of the people of the Malaysian region, the back seat is the place for us. That is not to say that we do not have a shared concern with other nations in the peace and development of the region. It does mean that to meet that concern and to safeguard our legitimate interests is by striving to do less rather than more in this serious political crisis.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senate an extract from a report of Senators BOGGS, FELL, former Senator Smith of Massachusetts and myself which was submitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations in February 1963, after completion of a mission to southeast Asia which was undertaken at the request of the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. This extract deals with the situation which existed in Malaya in the fall of 1962, a time which coincided with the beginning of the Malaysian Federation. The report reads as follows:

The same general principle of strict noninvolvement which is indicated as a sound basis for U.S. policies on Burma would appear also to apply to the emerging Malaysian Federation of Malaya, Singapore, Brunei, Sarawak, and North Borneo. There has been, as noted, a serious outbreak of violence in Brunei in connection with this transition. Moreover, since a number of groups, conscious of racial or tribal separativeness, will have to be joined in the Federation, other inner resistances may well develop. There are also international repercussions with respect to the proposed Federation. Already a serious strain has developed in Malayan-Indonesian relations and there have been

19024

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 10, 1965

lumber, mostly spruce, every 40 days. The new Alaska Pacific Lumber Co. at Wrangell, a \$4-million operation, is shipping its entire output of lumber to Japan.

Biggest project involving Japan is an agreement under consideration by the Union and Marathon Oil companies to supply the Tokyo Gas Co. with up to 230,000 tons of liquefied methane gas a year from Alaska. This would require investment, including cost of ships, of several hundred million dollars.

"Japan needs practically everything we have," says a State resources official. In 1964, the Japanese took 89 percent of Alaska's exports.

ALASKAN FISH STORY

Fisheries, the traditional resource of Alaska and its No. 1 industry, have made a big comeback under statehood, mostly in the Kodiak area.

Production of king crabs in 1964 was 86.7 million pounds, more than triple the 1960 catch.

The growing importance of the crab catch, an operation that goes on 10 months of the year, lessens the seasonal nature of the fishing industry.

Value of the salmon catch has jumped from \$6 million to more than \$94 million in the 1950-64 period.

Conservation and management of its fisheries is a constant problem for Alaska, as a growing number of Japanese and Russian catcher and factory ships are busy seining the seas of the northern Pacific.

"Japan is making a shambles of our conservation program," says a Federal fisheries official. "They have been robbing us for years," complains Gov. William Egan.

American fishermen are prohibited from fishing for salmon on the high seas with nets. Only on a limited number of days, depending on quantity and type of runs, are they allowed to fish for salmon at all. But there are no limitations, in use of gear or time of fishing on Japanese and Russian fleets.

Forest products, Alaska's second-biggest industry after fisheries, are a big and growing source of income. In the panhandle of southeast Alaska, a mild, moist climate encourages natural reproduction of cut-over areas within 3 years without planting. There are spruce and hemlock along nearly 1,000 miles of coastline from below Ketchikan to above Kodiak.

Forest-product exports, almost all to Japan, made up 82.5 percent of Alaska's total in 1964.

IRON-ORE DISCOVERY

Other natural resources hold a long-range potential for the future of Alaska, but they will require costly exploration and development.

Pan American Petroleum, a subsidiary of Standard Oil (Indiana), last year discovered iron-ore deposits of an estimated 1 billion tons about 200 miles southeast of Anchorage. Kennecott Copper plans to start drilling a shaft this autumn in an area near Kobuk, a village 50 miles north of the Arctic Circle. One company official's estimate is that Alaska could produce \$5 billion worth of minerals a year.

WELCOME TRAVELERS

Tourists are discovering Alaska in increasing numbers. Reconstruction following the earthquake has produced a large number of new hotels and motels—so many that prices are beginning to drop.

Last year, 61,000 airline travelers passed through Anchorage en route between New York and Tokyo.

Tours now are coming to Alaska during 6 to 7 months of the year, instead of only during the 3 summer months. There are more places to stay, more things to do. Much of Alaska is not the ice chest so many have been accustomed to think it is.

Central Alaska, where the bulk of the people live, has temperatures from 75 below zero to 100 above, but can have pleasant

weather for months. The southeast has cool summers, and winter temperatures not much below the range of Vancouver, British Columbia.

BETTER TRANSPORTATION

Improved transportation has been the big breakthrough for Alaska. Train ferries, barges carrying railroad cars and an improved State ferry system have increased the frequency of service and have lowered rates over a wide area of Alaska.

A Fairbanks grocer says shipping costs on canned goods are down 22 percent for vanload shipments. Trucks from Seattle reach Anchorage and Fairbanks in 80 hours. The Anchorage city dock in 1964 handled 159,000 tons of cargo, compared with 39,000 tons in 1961.

Studies are underway for paving the Alcan Highway, which runs 1,221 miles through Canada from Dawson Creek, B.C., and 302 miles through Alaska to Fairbanks. Only short stretches of this route are paved now. Cost of the improvements would be about \$175 million, and the big question is who should pay what share.

Alaska is the only one of the 50 States with a homesteading program. But, says one would-be pioneer who tried it and sold out: "It's a terrible trap. It costs so much time, money, and effort to clear the land of trees, stumps, and rocks, and then it takes 3 years just to dry out the land to plant things."

The Federal Government holds about 98 percent of Alaska's land. Over the next 25 years, the State can select 102,550,000 acres—an area the size of California and Connecticut combined—for sale by auction, plus some additional land for special purposes. Appraisals run from about \$5 to \$2,000 an acre.

Land is sold for 10 percent down and 9 years to pay the balance at 5 percent interest, with a limitation of 640 acres. Leasing of land is not limited.

FROST PROBLEM

The big problem, once land is cleared, is that there are only about 100 frost-free days in farming areas. Most crops cannot be grown. Those that are suitable, such as cabbage and lettuce, all mature at the same time, creating harvesting and marketing problems. Alaska produces only about 7 percent of the food it consumes.

There are only some 400 farms in the entire State. About 70 of these are dairy farms, most with fewer than 50 acres. One food distributor who buys from farmers says: "Trying to farm in Alaska is a sad joke."

POWER FOR INDUSTRY

Power from the Yukon River is seen by many as the key to Alaska's future. Three dams would produce about 10 million kilowatts of power, half at the proposed Rampart site, 90 miles northwest of Fairbanks.

"Since agriculture is not possible in Alaska," says U.S. Senator ERNEST GRUENING, a Democrat, "we need industry, and Rampart will attract that. Rampart is the most important single force in developing Alaska." Mr. GRUENING predicts a population increase of 70,000 to 140,000 if the Rampart power project—still only envisioned—is built.

The cost of a Rampart Dam, power facilities, and transmission lines to the U.S. border would be in excess of \$2 billion. Low-cost power, say proponents of the project, would more than offset high-cost labor, and would attract industry.

Construction work and filling the reservoir would take 20 to 25 years. Studies of the project have been made by the U.S. Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. These are before the Department of the Interior for recommendations.

Opposition to the Rampart project centers on its high cost, on the possibility that nuclear power will be available sooner and at lower cost, and on the prospect of damage to wildlife by the lake to be formed behind the proposed dam. This lake would cover 10,500 square miles—larger than Lake Erie.

The area to be flooded is inhabited by about 2,000 people and hundreds of thousands of ducks and other wildfowl and animals. A survey by the Fish and Wildlife Service found that "nowhere in the history of water development in North America have the fish and wildlife losses expected to result from such a project been so overwhelming."

HUCKSTERS GALORE?

Obstacles other than agriculture and uncertain power resources must be overcome, most officials agree. Chief among these is a vicious circle of high wages and high prices. One retailer, who has trouble keeping a staff, states: "The whole 49th State is filled with hucksters who are wild for a buck."

The price-wage spiral was set off by Alaska's distance from labor, supplies, and services. Military construction set the pace for the economy. Contractors have had to accept the labor rates asked, says one builder who put up hundreds of housing units in Anchorage.

A double standard of wages developed, one for construction, the other for regular work. A carpenter paid \$5.17 an hour for construction would be paid only \$3.50 an hour for maintenance work at a lumber mill. A highly skilled sawyer in a lumber mill gets \$4.86 an hour, compared with \$5.13 for the lowest-paid construction worker.

A building-supplies dealer in Fairbanks pays his salesmen \$1,025 a month straight salary. In Fairbanks, too, a bartender gets \$35 for each 8-hour shift. Still, many young people are leaving Alaska, contending that "you can hardly keep a family on what you make," because of high prices.

"GUTS AND MONEY"

Still, "For those with imagination, drive, a bit of guts and some money, Alaska holds an adventuresome future," says a Juneau resident who likes hunting and fishing.

Those without special aptitudes may find it difficult, warns Edmund Orbeck, a labor leader in Fairbanks. "Unless outsiders have a job already lined up, they shouldn't come," he adds. "Anyone who does is looking for trouble." Unions give precedence to Alaska residents.

Food prices have been coming down, especially since the advent of chain supermarkets. Shopping for items that are sale priced, says one housewife, brings prices to about the same level as in Seattle, except for milk, which costs from 83 to 97 cents a half gallon. Most clothing prices run about the same as in "the outside."

High cost of housing remains the principal bottleneck to lower living costs. Even a modest house goes for \$25,000 and up. The newest apartment building in Anchorage asks \$425 a month for a two-bedroom apartment. A one-room efficiency brings \$140 a month.

Rising taxes and the growing costs of local and State government services concern many Alaskans. If it weren't for the huge sums poured in by the Federal Government—\$500 million in the last 12 months—their financial problems would be overwhelming.

A NEW UTOPIA?

When Alaska achieved statehood on January 3, 1959, optimistic Alaskans felt they had a chance to build "a utopian society." In the next few years, beset by problems of building a State government, many regretted the shift from territorial status.

Now, after 6½ years, visitors hear few laments. More and more Alaskans are sure that the 1964 earthquake was the takeoff date for the advancement of a new and successful society.

Frederic Brewster
VIETNAM—THE NEED FOR MAINTAINING A STRONG U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Vietnam crisis has graphically illustrated

August 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19023

The next stage will embrace cities with populations over 300,000. The third stage, which the Government hopes to complete within 2 years, will extend the system to cities with more than 100,000 people.

On the basis of the experience during the first 2 years the Government will then decide whether to extend the system to cities with more than 50,000 inhabitants.

The ministers decided today that the ration for manual laborers would be increased by 10 percent.

By limiting consumption by all but manual laborers to 12 ounces, or 2.4 ounces under the national average, the Government hopes to do the following:

Limit consumption in surplus areas and thereby provide more grains for deficit areas. Cut down on the import of grains, particularly of rice which must be paid for in scarce foreign exchange.

India imports 6 million tons of wheat a year under the U.S. agricultural surplus program. However, such imports are paid for in rupees.

Two million tons of rice are imported every year, chiefly from Thailand and Cambodia, and are paid for in foreign exchange.

PROPOSED REMOVAL OF TARIFF DUTY ON SYNTHETIC DIAMOND ABRASIVE CRYSTALS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] who is necessarily absent today, I make the following observation with regard to H.R. 7969:

Mr. President, I am very much interested in that section of the Finance Committee report to accompany H.R. 7969, which pertains to so-called synthetic diamond dust. I say "so-called" because what we are talking about in section 27 of the bill is not what the layman would think of as dust. It would be better recognized as diamond abrasive crystals and is referred to in industry as bort or grit used for grinding wheels, cutting tools, masonry saws, and the like. Industrial diamond bort or grit is very important in industry and is particularly important from the standpoint of being a strategic material, absolutely necessary to our industrial economy and very important in any geared-up war emergency economy as evidenced by the fact that natural diamond has always been in the national stockpile.

Because of its industrial and strategic importance, I believe that the Commerce Department and the Department of Defense will have a definite interest in any proposed removal of the tariff duty on synthetic diamond. At such time as H.R. 7969 is considered by the House and Senate conferees, I trust that the interested Government departments will have been given an opportunity to offer their views on this very important matter.

ECONOMIC PROGRESS IN ALASKA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, an excellent summary of recent developments and economic activity in Alaska is found in the August 16 issue of U.S. News & World Report. It ascribes some of this activity to the earthquake and properly so, but more pertinent would be to ascribe this activity to the coming of statehood 6 years ago and its beneficial consequences.

As a result of statehood, the fisheries, long Alaska's greatest economic resource and depleted almost to the vanishing point under Federal mismanagement while Alaska was a territory, have now experienced a strong comeback under the wiser conservationist policies of the State department of fish and game.

The Statehood Act likewise provided that Alaska should receive 90 percent of the oil royalties since Alaska is not a reclamation State and does not get the benefits of reclamation legislation as do other Western States.

Statehood voided the exclusion of Alaska from the benefits of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, familiarly known in Alaska as the Jones Act.

Statehood brought the inclusion of Alaska in the Federal-aid highway program, from which it had been totally excluded from 1916 to 1956 and was only partially included in the 3 years preceding statehood.

Whereas prior to statehood 99.2 percent of Alaska's land was in Federal domain, the State is beginning to acquire some of the 103 million acres to which the Statehood Act entitled it.

In addition to that and other beneficial changes wrought by statehood, State agencies are making possible development which was not possible under Federal control.

While much remains to be done and Alaska still suffers and will suffer for some time to come the economic consequences of its 92 years of territorialism, with its discriminations and omissions, it is gratifying to see our State steadily moving into high gear and demonstrating thereby the eternal soundness of that basic American principle of government by consent of the governed, which statehood made possible.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the U.S. News & World Report of August 16, entitled: "The New Alaska: Ready To Take Off," be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, Aug. 16, 1965]

THE NEW ALASKA: READY TO TAKE OFF

(NOTE.—America's 49th State, a storehouse of resources, has been handicapped by its geographical position and by shortages of people and capital. Now, rebuilding after the 1964 earthquake, Alaska is humming with activity, confident of a bright future.)

ANCHORAGE.—Alaska's big earthquake of 1964, it is now becoming clear, jolted more than the earth.

The Good Friday quake shook up the people of the 49th State, shocked them into action. And, as a result, Alaska for the first time is getting more of what it always needed—people, money, construction and a diversity of jobs.

Fisheries, the State's biggest industry, have made a comeback. Forest products are providing more jobs than ever before. Oil and gas are hotbeds of activity, with new exploration and discovery mounting daily.

Tourist business is at a new peak. Hotels and motels are going up at a rapid rate. Transportation facilities are much improved.

Some problems, particularly the high cost of living, remain. But even this barrier to development is being whittled away, and some prices have come down.

The earthquake claimed 123 lives and caused vast property damage. But, most Alaskans agree, the temblor also set off an economic spurt.

"It got a lot of people to thinking about changing and improving," says an Anchorage real estate man. "We learned how to move materials fast."

REAL BOOM COUNTRY

Disaster aid and loans from the Government have poured \$325 million into Alaska since the earthquake. This, with uncounted millions in private investment, is making the State what one Anchorage banker calls "a real boom country."

Kodiak is described by a fisheries official as "the hottest area in Alaska right now." It has three new hotels, one of them a former passenger liner, and new airport facilities.

Anchorage is getting \$28 million worth of private and public construction this year. This includes the building of two high-rise hotels and an 11-story bank building.

Other expansion projects in this, Alaska's largest city, include docking and warehousing facilities and three new shopping centers.

People, too, are flocking to Alaska. Says an Anchorage hotel operator: "We were 80 percent filled all winter and haven't had a vacancy since April 1."

For the first time in Alaska's history, growth is on a broad basis, providing new goods and services and a diversity of jobs. There is a steady spread of the tax base once almost wholly dependent on Government spending.

OIL: 30,000 BARRELS A DAY

The oil and gas industry is becoming of increasing importance to Alaska. It is, says C. W. Snedden, Fairbanks publisher, "our biggest economic crutch."

On two occasions, sale of oil and gas leases provided the funds for meeting large deficits in Alaska's budget. The State received \$14.5 million last year from royalties and other fees.

Since 1957, when the Discovery well was brought in by Richfield Oil, production has increased to a rate of 11 million barrels a year. Current output from 62 wells exceeds 30,000 barrels a day.

So far this year, several new oil and gas wells of major size have been brought in, expanding sizably the 460-million-barrel reserve estimated at the start of 1965. Exploration and development spending this year will far exceed the \$64.5 million spent in 1964.

New platforms being built over Cook Inlet will, for the first time, permit year-round drilling. Cook Inlet has 8-knot currents, 30-foot shifts in tide levels and temperatures that drop to 50° below zero—probably the most difficult and expensive drilling conditions in the world. Despite this, more than 20 companies have operations in Alaska, and the number is growing.

Alaska recently offered more than 750,000 acres for leasing north of the Arctic Circle, eastward from Point Barrow. Major oil companies have teams in the area and are bringing in equipment for drilling.

Availability of oil and gas has greatly reduced fuel costs in Alaska. For example, the Matanuska Milk Dairy is saving about \$3,000 monthly in power costs at its new plant in Anchorage by using gas produced in the State.

HOW JAPAN HELPS

Japan's need for raw materials in increasing amounts is another boon to the expanding Alaskan economy. There has been a steady exchange of trade missions between Japan and Alaska in recent years.

Japan has provided most of the \$70 million pumped into development of the Sitka Pulp & Lumber Co., which produces 520 tons of wood pulp a day for Japanese buyers. The same Japanese interests own the Wrangell Lumber Co., which exports a shipload of

August 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19025

again the need for maintaining a strong U.S. merchant marine.

I have spoken before about the supply requirements of a modern army, which necessitated the use of 600 cargo ships for logistic support of our troops in Korea.

There is another critical use for American vessels, however, and that is for troop transport. Although Secretary of Defense McNamara said 4 years ago that all future troop transport would be by air, last week the entire 1st Cavalry Division, with 400 helicopters and all of its supplies, embarked for Vietnam—by ship.

Helen Delich Bentley, the maritime editor of the Baltimore Sun, reported on this embarkation and other possible requirements for use of the merchant marine in the Vietnam war effort. I believe that Mrs. Bentley's article is a valuable reminder of the increasing strategic importance of a strong American merchant fleet.

I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Bentley's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST CAVALRY TO GO BY SEA—DIVISION TO EMBARK SOON FOR VIET WAR

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

WASHINGTON, August 3.—The 1st Cavalry (Airmobile) Division, its 400 helicopters and all of its support supplies, will be sent to Vietnam by sea with embarkation of the troops to begin next week.

Only a "limited number of advance personnel" will make the 6,000-mile trip by air. President Johnson last week announced that he ordered the 1st Cavalry Division "immediately" to the Vietnam front. It will be the first full division on the battle scene, a Department of Defense spokesman said tonight. There are units of divisions but no full division there, he added.

PORTS NAMED

The first units of the 1st Cavalry Division, stationed at Fort Benning, Ga., will be embarked on the ports of Charleston, S.C., and Savannah, Ga., aboard at least two of the six troop transports that are being removed from their normal Atlantic operation to enter Vietnam service.

Loading of the helicopters will also take place next week aboard the Navy aircraft carrier Bozer in Mayport, the naval base adjacent to Jacksonville, Fla., and aboard Military Sea Transportation Service aircraft ferries at Mobile, Ala.

Aircraft engineering personnel will accompany the craft loaded on each of the vessels. In addition, some 35 to 40 "formerly strike-bound" freighters have been chartered by the MSTs to pick up the support equipment needed for the 1st Cavalry Division and the units already in Vietnam.

TO GET SUPPLIES

Those loading for the division will pick up their supplies at East and Gulf seaports also beginning next week, it was said.

The six troop transports are capable of handling an entire division of 15,000 men by a simple conversion which requires about 24 hours of work by the ship's crew. It is referred to as "immediate emergency berthing" and enables the crew to make necessary changes to the cabins and troop quarters that will permit them to at least double their normal capacity when carrying military personnel.

No. 146—3

COUP FOR SHIPPERS

The fact that the first major movement of troops being sent to the Asian battlefield is going by sea rather than air is considered a major coup for the shipping industry which has been waging an uphill campaign emphasizing the continuing need for passenger ships as well as cargo vessels for defense purposes.

More than 4 years ago, Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, told a congressional committee that there was no further need to build or subsidize American-flag passenger ships because all troop movements in the future would go by air.

A year later at the height of the Cuban missile crisis, the Defense Department had alerted the owners of American-flag passenger liners to stand by for their employment if troops were to be sent to the nearby Caribbean island.

The SS *United States*, which has been immobilized by a seamen's strike since June, is capable of transporting an entire division with all of its equipment after only 1 week of conversion work to transform her from a luxurious Atlantic liner to a troop transport.

TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND TRANSPORTED

The six troop transports which are being removed from their regular Atlantic service ferried 200,000 military personnel and their dependents between Europe and the United States last year. They are all operated by the Military Sea Transportation Service.

Should it become necessary to provide more space in each of these transports, they will have to be sent to shipyards so additional decks can be welded in their holds.

Then the capacity of each again will be doubled.

In addition to the 35 to 40 strikebound freighters, 15 additional cargo ships have been taken out of the reserve fleets and are being reactivated in private shipyards for participation in the Vietnam crisis.

The 1st Cavalry Division with the "Airmobile" inserted in the middle of its name is described as being "a new organization with a very large group of helicopters" and a "fast moving, light outfit."

ROGER BLOUGH EXPLAINS STEEL COMPETITION—HITS FOREIGN DUMPING

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it is important that the United States, as a nation dedicated to the free enterprise system under which our economy has grown and flourished, not lose sight of the need to preserve the chief ingredient of this development—spirited but fair competition. Many of the laws to which our domestic producers are subject are dedicated to this end. Yet only the basic Antidumping Act of 1921 is available to insure that foreign producers, while protecting the price levels in their home markets, do not use U.S. markets as a dumping ground for their surpluses.

On this score, I noted with particular interest the "Letter to the Editor" from Roger M. Blough, chairman of the United States Steel Corp., which appeared in the May issue of *Nation's Business*. In it he outlined the many-faceted nature of present-day competition in steel, and cited the danger of continued pricing of imports at dumping levels. He pointed out:

Competitors should compete under comparable pricing laws. If they do, there

should be no objection to foreign steel competition.

Mr. President, this is the underlying approach of our continuing efforts to amend the U.S. Antidumping Act. It is basic to the support given S. 2045 by Senator HARTKE, the principal Democratic sponsor, and me as the principal Republican cosponsor. The same holds true for many of our colleagues in Congress, including the 30 other Senate cosponsors of S. 2045, the 1965 Antidumping Act Amendment. As we consider its aims to make the U.S. law a fairer, more effective antidumping measure, let us keep in mind the consequences of dumping which interferes unfairly with this competitive mechanism that we have so long nourished.

I heartily invite my colleagues' attention to Mr. Blough's statement in the belief that its lucid analysis will be of benefit to discussions of the nature of the dumping problem and the threat of its growth with which many of our American industries, as well as American labor, are faced.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Blough's letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES STEEL CHAIRMAN EXPLAINS COMPETITION

To the Editor:

To compete successfully in today's dynamic and ever-changing marketplace, it is not enough to produce a usable quality product. A company, to survive in today's competitive arena, must arm itself with every modern weapon available to it and, at the same time, have in reserve the most imaginative and resourceful minds in its field, probing and searching the unknown for the answers to its customers' present and future demands.

In the case of the steel companies, competition has meant a long succession of innovation, of intense struggle for markets. Yesterday's facts are not the facts of today, and today's facts are not those of tomorrow. For, as in other industries, the steel industry's customers, markets, marketing, materials, finance, technology, management, economics, and the labor force are ever in flux, ever changing.

In the competitive free enterprise system, market prices result from prices sought by the sellers and prices that buyers are willing to pay. For while a producer is free to seek whatever prices he thinks are attainable, the market always has the final word.

Steel, for example, sells at thousands of prices inasmuch as it is available in literally thousands of shapes, sizes, strengths, finishes, and chemical compositions. For the most part, steel products are tailored to individual customer specifications. Steel prices frequently differ by region; they are not static; they fluctuate. To be sure, prices for particular products tend to converge under competition. But actual prices of steel products often vary among producers and from published prices.

Competition in steel, as in most industries, is worldwide. For practically all of the first six decades of the 20th century, the U.S. economy was a net exporter of steel mill products. Starting with 1959 and in every year since, imports have exceeded exports. Much of the imported steel has been sold at prices substantially below those prevailing in

19026

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 10, 1965

the country of origin and in the U.S.A. This practice of selling in export markets at prices below those prevailing in the exporting country, when accompanied by injury or threat of injury to the industry of the importing country, is regarded as "dumping" and is condemned by most nations. And although prohibited by the signatory countries to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and by Federal law, such pricing of imports continues.

International trade is vital. No country today is self-sufficient, and every country benefits by buying and selling in world markets. But competitors should compete under comparable pricing laws. If they do, there should be no objection to foreign steel competition.

Steel is indeed a highly competitive business. It is subject to the many varied price and cost factors that confront all competitive industry. Interference with this competitive mechanism can only result in reduced benefits for the consumer and the investor, reduced job opportunities for the worker, and reduced economic growth for the Nation.

ROGER M. BLOUGH,
Chairman, Board of Directors,
United States Steel Corp.

NEW YORK.

FIVE YEARS AS A NATION: THE IVORY COAST

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Saturday, August 7, was the national independence day for the Republic of Ivory Coast. This new nation under the able leadership of President Felix Houphouët-Boigny has earnestly undertaken its international responsibilities as a sovereign state. Six weeks after her independence in 1960, the Ivory Coast was admitted to the United Nations and was later elected to a seat on the Security Council for the term beginning January 1964. Within Africa the Ivory Coast commands great respect, for President Houphouët-Boigny since his early career in preindependence days has been a dynamic and devoted leader for regional cooperation on the African continent, maintaining that the only true road to African solidarity is through step-by-step economic and political cooperation with recognition of the principle of nonintervention in the internal affairs of sister African states.

To this nation which shuns involvement in cold war issues yet remains a friend of the West the United States has provided modest economic aid, supporting the Ivory Coast's program of rapid, orderly economic development. With an economy already more diversified than any other in west Africa, the Ivory Coast has undertaken to increase public expenditure and encourage greater private investment in the growing industrial sector, looking forward to 1970 as the terminal date for foreign assistance needs.

Mr. President, it has long been the belief of Americans that a people's interests are best served and the potentialities for liberty most promoted through self-determination of political and economic policy. It is this belief, inextricably bound up with our own heritage, that causes us to take pride in the achievements of such newly independent nations as the Republic of Ivory Coast. I know that many Americans join with me in saluting the people of

the Ivory Coast as they celebrate their national independence.

THE CHALLENGE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on Sunday night, August 8, 1965, I had the privilege of attending the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity Convention in Chicago, Ill. In an address to the convention, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY brought to our attention in meaningful fashion the real challenge facing the human rights movement in the United States. He emphasized that although we have created an adequate body of legislation for equal legal rights, we must begin to create a climate of equal respect in which the capacities of all men, whether Negro or white, for creativity and the pursuit of excellence may flourish and grow.

We should remember that the law, in addition to being a coercive force, must function as well as a teacher. By directing the actions of the citizen, it must produce a change in attitude. Without a change in public attitude, all the legislation in the world cannot guarantee racial equality. Up to now, we have accomplished the legal abolition of the practices of segregation, and we have obtained a grudging tolerance, a lowering of formal legal barriers, a removal of "white only" signs from drinking fountains, school doors, and waiting rooms. We must do more than achieve minimum compliance with the law, motivated more by the fear of jails than by an honest request for one's fellow man. While this is necessary and worthy of our first efforts, it is merely an initial goal.

Beyond this lies the true meaning of "integration." Beyond this lies acceptance—acceptance of every fellow citizen as a man with heart and mind, body and soul. This goal may remain unreachd when every lunch counter in the Nation has dropped its formal barriers to Negro entry. It may remain unreachd when every Negro is allowed the full and equal right to vote and participate in the political process of his State and city. It may, as well, remain unreachd when the last Negro has stepped off the sidewalk and tipped his hat to the passing white man. But we must begin now to reach the day when we have a nation in which every man is accepted at his own worth.

Mr. President, I call the attention of the U.S. Senate to this remarkable speech, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, CONVENTION, ALPHA PHI ALPHA FRATERNITY, CHICAGO, AUGUST 9, 1965

It is an honor and a pleasure to be back with Alpha Phi Alpha tonight. In 1948, I spoke before your annual convention at Atlantic City.

At that time you were concerned with awakening Negroes to the potentialities of full citizenship and fine education, with providing money through scholarships and loans to the talented who could benefit most from advanced learning, and with fighting legal battles to strike down discriminatory barriers.

At that time I was about to first enter the U.S. Senate.

At that time this country was slowly becoming aware of the critical social issue of the postwar period—the full entrance of the Negro into American society.

Tonight, 17 years later, we have come a long way.

We have seen legalized prejudice and discrimination stricken from the statute books of America.

Many people of courage and dedication, with black skins and with white, have risked—and sometimes lost—their lives in assailing the barriers of legalized discrimination.

The dignity and the compassion—the manifestation of true fraternal love—which has characterized these efforts is a source of pride to all Americans.

With the series of Supreme Court decisions culminating in the historic *Brown v. Board of Education* case in 1954—and with the sequence of congressional actions leading to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965—this initial phase of the civil struggle is now drawing to a close.

Much remains to be done until these decisions of our Government are fully implemented—and, as the President's civil rights coordinator, I can report to you tonight that determined efforts are being made within the Federal structure.

But now the American people have been called to answer another, more challenging question: Do we have the imagination, the commitment, and compassion to construct a society which gives full meaning to the phrase "full citizenship," where every citizen has an equal opportunity in fact—not just in law?

For the first time in history, this Nation possesses the intellectual strength and the economic resources to create the conditions in which every American can be a full partner in the enterprise of democracy.

We possess the knowledge and the wealth. But do we also possess the determination and the will to complete this task?

To be sure, a number of Negroes have overcome great handicaps and are able to compete on equal terms with other citizens. Indeed, all the men of Alpha—represented by such men as Thurgood Marshall, Whitney Young, Martin Luther King, John Johnson, and Judge Perry B. Jackson, Judge Sidney A. Jones, and Judge L. Howard Bennett—are notable representatives of the American Negro community today capable of both producing and enjoying the benefits of American society.

We know of the encouraging increase of Negro enrollment in college and in professional schools, of the rising income level among Negroes, of more challenging and responsible jobs available to Negroes, and of the declining rate of school dropouts among Negroes as compared to the population in general.

We know that Negro Americans are succeeding despite the handicaps of prejudice, of closed doors, of limited or nonexistent educational opportunities, and of the deep psychological wound of being a Negro in a period where this usually meant second-class citizenship and back-of-the-bus treatment.

But despite the advances of this Negro minority, we know also the pathos of countless citizens in this country. These people are almost a nation unto themselves—an underdeveloped country of urban ghettos and rural slums whose inhabitants are only dimly aware of the advances in civil rights and are only rarely touched by them.

President Johnson spoke about the stark dimensions of this other America in his Howard University address. He pointed to the uprooted, the unemployed, and the dispossessed. He pointed to staggering problems of unemployment, of disease, of illit-

August 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19083

gan with one man firing a single shot, the shot heard around the world. No government fired that shot, no paid soldier pulled the trigger. The shot was fired by an individual, and the shot proclaimed "I am a free man." Yes, freedom began with an individual.

So, if there is in this audience today, someone with teenage children, perhaps you will be good enough to explain to them what I have tried to say to you.

Since this generation has chosen to abandon freedom, perhaps someone in the next generation will choose to stand up as an individual and fire a shot heard around the world, a verbal shot, if you please, which will choose freedom over security.

I dearly hope so.

Reverend Taylor
**A CHRISTIAN MINISTER SPEAKS
OUT ON VIETNAM POLICY**

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, because of the fact that a number of clergymen have been participating in some of the "peace at any price" demonstrations against taking a firm stand in Vietnam, an impression has been created that a firm stand in Vietnam may be un-Christian and does not, therefore, meet with the approval of the clergy in this country.

The Calhoun Times of St. Matthews, S.C., has printed in its August 5, 1965, issue an outstanding defense of U.S. involvement in Vietnam by Rev. Wallace N. Taylor, pastor of the First Baptist Church of St. Matthews.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Reverend Taylor's statement be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Matthews (S.C.) Calhoun Times, Aug. 5, 1965]

REVEREND TAYLOR SPEAKS OUT ON VIETNAM POLICY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following letter was written by the Reverend Wallace N. Taylor, pastor of the First Baptist Church of St. Matthews. It was written by Reverend Taylor in response to a form letter he received from Edwin T. Dohlberg for the Clergymen's Emergency Committee for Vietnam. We commend Reverend Taylor for the stand he has taken on the matter. Our only wish is that we had more ministers for Christ who would also take this stand rather than joining in civil rights debates and the like. Reverend Taylor's letter is as follows:)

SPEAKING OUT: A CLERGYMAN'S DEFENSE OF OUR INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM

In recent weeks we have had a great deal of discussion on the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Recently many young men and women demonstrated in Washington, carrying placards upon which were printed "Get Out of Vietnam," "We Won't Fight in Vietnam," and so forth. In participating in this demonstration these young people have been encouraged from various sources.

One of these sources has been the clergymen. Many of the clergymen have been saying, "we should get out of Vietnam." Recently I received a letter from Dr. Edwin T. Dohlberg, former president of the National Council of Churches. I understand that this letter was sent to a number of ministers. Writing for the "Clergymen's Emergency Committee for Vietnam" of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, Nyack, N.Y., he urged us to express ourselves "as it was important that the President should know how the leaders in our Nation's religious life feel about this country's involvement in

Vietnam." The religious leaders were being asked to help communicate this information to the White House. It was further stated that according to the New York Times, President Johnson "carries around in his pocket a series of private polls of public opinion on American policy in Vietnam."

In Dr. Dohlberg's letter we were asked to check one of the following:

1. I favor intensifying and extending the war in Vietnam.

2. I would like the United States to initiate efforts now to negotiate peace in Vietnam.

It may be noted that neither option gives any hint that there is anything evil about Communist aggression nor that the United States should be commended for coming to the defense of self-determination of a small nation. It might be pointed out that clergymen who are opposed to our involvement in Vietnam aren't always opposed to the use of Federal force. In the recent demonstration in Alabama many of these same clergymen—who oppose our involvement in Vietnam—were highly in favor of the show of Federal force in Alabama.

I strongly protest the kind of pressure now being exerted upon President Johnson by many ministers urging us to get out of Vietnam. Not long ago in Australia a group of ministers were reported to have made their protests of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam known to one of their national leaders. He rebuked them and told them they did not know all that was involved. Many clergymen appear today to think themselves to be infallible and qualified to speak on any subject.

We are in Vietnam because North Vietnam does not respect the sovereignty of South Vietnam and North Vietnam is committed to aggression. To permit Communist aggression in Vietnam is to say to the Communists, we will permit aggression anywhere in the world wherever you make a move. Many of our clergymen seem to want peace at any price and never condemn Communist aggression or ever seem to understand the nature of its threat. In Vietnam as elsewhere we should stand to defend freedom against aggression and slavery.

As a Christian I see no conflict in my position in regard to what the Bible teaches regarding war. In fact, while studying for the ministry in 1943, I left college and went into the Army. I served in combat in Europe with the 26th Infantry Division receiving three battle stars, the French Fourragere and the Purple Heart. I had four brothers who served in the Armed Forces and would have felt ashamed to stay home and let them offer their lives for my freedom. I see no conflict in a Christian serving in the Armed Force nor of using these forces anywhere they need to be used to stop aggression.

While I do not glory in war, I feel that there may be occasions when it is the lesser of two evils. There are occasions when a particular war may be a just war, and it would be a Christian's duty to engage in it. Sometimes we are confronted by two alternatives, neither of which is Christian, both are evil but one is less evil than the other. Sometimes it is less evil to go to war than to go and let the enemy hold in slavery millions who want to be free.

From a Biblical viewpoint we notice that the children of Israel were commanded to engage in warfare. In the New Testament there is no specific word against warfare. After Christ healed the Roman captain's servant (Luke 8:13), he commended the soldier for his faith and said nothing to him against his military profession. John the Baptist had Roman soldiers to ask him what they must do to prepare for the Messiah; he told them but gave them no lectures on the sinfulness of soldiering and the wickedness of war (Luke 3:14). In the Book of Acts, chapter 10, is recorded the conversion of Cornelius. There is no mention that as a

Christian he could no longer serve his country as a soldier.

If a nation would preserve its independence today, it is necessary for it to maintain a national police force. The purpose of such a force is to preserve order, peace, and to protect its rights and the rights of smaller nations. When justice, peace, and integrity are endangered a nation must use its army.

In the world crisis today there are spiritual values that are at stake. We must resist that which would destroy us and destroy as well the faith that has made our Nation great. Judging from what communism has done wherever it now enslaves, we should face frankly the fact that should it control the world the Christian witness could survive only through the suffering and martyrdom of faithful disciples. Freedom for ourselves and for our children are worth dying for. Thank God for our men now giving themselves in Vietnam for our freedom. We should stay in Vietnam as long as it takes to let the Communists know we won't stand for aggression. If need be we should intensify our efforts there to win the war against aggression.

Pacifism has been tried as a national policy by other nations throughout history only to find that sooner or later you have to stand up to aggression or a nation will lose its freedom. For a nation to be weak and irresolute is to invite failure. If the Communists understand only the language of military power then we must give them a lesson in their own language.

Should we get out of Vietnam? No, a thousand times no—not until the Communist world sees that we mean business and ceases their aggression.

**DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT**

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1599) to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there is no stated need by which the creation of a new Cabinet Department of Housing and Urban Development can be justified.

Two words which are much in the news these days are appropriate in considering S. 1599, which would create such a department. These two words are "proliferation" and "escalation."

The creation of a new Cabinet-rank Department of Housing and Urban development is but a further step in the "proliferation" of Government agencies and resultant employees. The proposed new Department would perform no functions which are not already being performed by existing Government agencies. It must be assumed that the duties and responsibilities of existing agencies are being performed adequately, or else their continued existence or present staffing would have to be considered in jeopardy.

If this legislation is approved, "escalation" of the duties and responsibilities of the agency will naturally follow. The Cabinet-ranking Department has a way of generating proposals and ideas designed to extend its influence and further ingrain its power over new and expanded areas of concern. Many of these would be responsibilities and duties not contemplated upon the creation of the Department.

The bill presents a fundamental question of policy and constitutional author-

19084

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 10, 1965

ity. Although there is a multitude of Federal programs now on the books relating to urban and municipal problems, the primary authority and responsibility for dealing with these problems on a day-to-day basis remains with local officials. Over the past few years, the Federal Government has encroached upon these local responsibilities to an ever-increasing extent. The pending bill, if enacted, would indicate a shift in the primary responsibility from local to Federal officials. This would be detrimental to effective and responsive local government.

The primary justification advanced for the creation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development is the rapidly increasing urban population and the increased urban problems which are created thereby. This is said to require a Cabinet-level voice to represent the interests of this segment of our population. To fortify this conclusion, reliance is had on statistics which show that at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, only 5 percent of the population was in the urban areas. Today, the urban population has grown to 70 percent. From now to the year 2000, it is estimated that approximately 80 percent of the population increase will occur in urban areas.

Admittedly, these are impressive statistics. Nevertheless, an important point is conveniently overlooked in dealing with people only as statistics. The increase in urban population is accompanied by an increase in productivity and in the tax base needed to meet the financial burdens of the area. The increase in population provides all the potential resources required for the urban areas to meet their own responsibilities, if they are correctly utilized. By no means least among the potential gains from population increases is the manpower, both mental and physical, required to cope with the challenge.

Mr. President, I want to stress the use of the term "responsibility." Not only do the urban areas have the authority to solve their own local problems, but they have the duty and responsibility to do so.

The pending bill would do no more than to superimpose a Cabinet position upon existing Federal agencies. The Cabinet position is designed to be the focal point in the administration and coordination of urban programs now on the books. While the proper interagency coordination of urban programs is a desirable goal, this is not the best, or even a proper way of achieving the desired result. There are dangers inherent in such a position which mitigate against its creation.

Coordinating all Federal programs affecting urban areas under one department head would create a vehicle so powerful at the national level as to make a mockery of local authority and responsibility. Cities, towns, and counties would tend to rely more and more on assistance, both financial and otherwise, from the national level for the solution of local problems. Local initiative would take a back seat to Federal direction and supervision.

Another danger inherent in the proposal to centralize all urban affairs under a Cabinet officer is the bypassing of State officials. The Department of Housing and Urban Affairs would, in most instances, deal directly with local officials and the responsible officers of the State would have little, if any, voice in the affair. The better approach would seem to be encouraging the States to assume a more responsible attitude toward their political subdivisions. When the National Government is organized to exert more power over urban activities, State involvement will naturally decrease. The authoritative and responsible role of the States in assisting in local urban affairs would be ended. Intergovernmental relations would become a matter of two levels of operations, Federal-local, and lead to a dominance by the National Government, which must be avoided.

Mr. President, the proposed new Cabinet Department of Housing and Urban Development is not desirable because it prescribes a permanent expanding role for the National Government in areas where private enterprise would and should do the job. Urban renewal funds, which would be under the jurisdiction of the new Cabinet Department, are being increasingly used for nonhousing renewal. There are many Members of Congress who question the desirability of using a larger percentage of these funds to build office buildings and other such projects. There is a strong likelihood that an expanded urban renewal program under the Department of Housing and Urban Development will more and more concern itself with the construction of urban and commercial facilities rather than housing.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is a striking example of the type of escalation which can be expected if this new Cabinet-level Department is created. In the few short years since its creation, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with all its subsidiary agencies has increased its expenditures by more than 300 percent. The employment in the Department has more than doubled and the payroll costs have almost quadrupled. It is obvious that the same growth rate will result if Congress creates a new Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. President, aside from those reasons, I remind the Senators that many of the programs to be administered by the new Department are of doubtful constitutionality.

Nowhere in the Constitution of the United States is there reference to the authority of the National Government to subsidize city or county government, or the government of any other subdivision of a State.

There is, therefore, very serious question as to whether a bill such as this would be constitutional.

For these reasons I am opposed to S. 1599. I ask the Senate to reject the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, as a

member of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations, I should like to respond briefly to the arguments made by the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina. These arguments are matters of substantial concern for us all. They were considered most carefully by both the subcommittee and the full Committee on Government Operations.

The pending bill is a very simple one. It would not increase the jurisdiction of the departments involved, nor would it carry with it the requirement that additional funds be spent. However, it would simply, for reasons of efficiency, responsiveness, and responsibility on the part of the Government, place these various activities concerned, functions already being performed by the Federal Government, under one department with Cabinet status, and, furthermore, focus emphasis upon the tremendous needs in the urban areas of the country.

The agricultural and rural needs of the country have long been recognized by virtue of the provision of Cabinet status for the Department of Agriculture. I come from one of the great agricultural States of the country. I believe that it is well for the rural and agricultural needs of the country to be handled by a department with Cabinet status. But, Mr. President, some 70 percent of the people of this country now live in metropolitan areas. It is estimated that before very long 80 to 85 percent of the people of this country will live in metropolitan areas.

I am not certain that that is a good thing. I wish that people still lived back in the rural areas and in the small towns to the degree they used to. Their problems then were much less than they are now in the great centers of mass population. However, the fact is that they do not live in the rural areas and small towns to the extent they once did. The people live in metropolitan centers. The Government must face up to the facts of life. I believe that the Government must today give Cabinet status to those functions of the Federal Government in which an attempt is made to come to grips with the great problems of our urban areas and the centers of mass population.

The other argument was that this would reduce the authority of the States and municipalities. Some other opponents consider that the new Department of Housing and Urban Development would be a rival to State and local governments.

I point out that the distinguished and able chairman of our subcommittee, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. FRIEDMAN], is himself a former Governor of his great State.

In addition to that service, and service in the U.S. Senate, the Senator from Connecticut has also served as a Cabinet officer. The Senator from Connecticut understands rather well the respective responsibilities of States, municipalities, and the Federal Government. That philosophy, recognizing the rights and responsibilities of all divisions of gov-

August 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19107

The situation is grave enough for the Federal authorities to invoke the existing laws against sedition and treason. Congress has not so declared it but the Nation is at war. A soldier in uniform who did what the agitators are trying to get Negroes subject to the draft to do, and who are urging Negroes in the services to stage hunger strikes, would be subject to a court-martial at least.

A soldier who behaved in such a fashion in battle would be subject to being shot to death on the spot by the nearest ranking officer.

As for the draft-card burners, they deserve to be drafted, not for service in uniform alongside honorable men, but for labor battalions digging latrines and trenches as close to the enemy positions as would be safe for the guard details that would be necessary to get them there.

MAN ARRESTED FOR FOURTH TIME THIS YEAR ON CHARGE OF RAPE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues an article from the Evening Star of August 9, 1965, reporting on a man being arrested for a fourth time this year on a charge of rape in the District of Columbia. This time the man was actually caught in the act of committing the crime. According to another report in the Washington Post of this morning, the police brought in the arrested man on three previous occasions, but one indictment was dismissed by the District Court on a technicality and another indictment was dismissed because the complainant committed suicide prior to the time of the trial.

Mr. President, on June 29, 1965, I made a speech in the Senate on the increasing crime rate in America and my remarks were based around an article from the Evening Star reporting on the release of this same man who has been arrested for the fourth rape charge this year. This article reported that the judge had to release the defendant "reluctantly." In commenting on the action, Judge George L. Hart, Jr., refuted the idea that decisions of the courts in the District of Columbia have nothing to do with the crime rate in Washington. He stated, and I quote:

The U.S. court of appeals sets the law. This court has to follow it * * * this man has not been found guilty, but certainly justice seems to cry out that he should face a jury of his peers.

I do not know all of the specifics in this matter, Mr. President, but this case is illustrative of many of the cases here in the District of Columbia and throughout this country in which the rights of the individual have been placed above the rights of society in administering justice in our land.

J. Edgar Hoover, the president of the American Bar Association, and countless others who are learned in the law and who are recognized authorities in the field of law enforcement have warned time and again against decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court which have served to effectively tie the hands of our police officers in trying to bring criminals to justice and protect the public against the ever-increasing crime rate in this country.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article from the Evening Star be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN SEIZED ATTACKING WAITRESS

A laborer with three arrests for rape this year was charged with rape and robbery early today after police said they found him attacking a woman in a garage in Northeast Washington.

Police charged Thomas H. Washington, 22, of the 200 block of Kentucky Avenue S.E., with rape and robbery of a 24-year-old waitress.

The woman told police she was walking home at 3:30 a.m. when a man approached her in the 1000 block of C Street N.E., threw his arms around her neck and told her he would kill her if she screamed.

As she struggled with the man her hand was cut by a linoleum knife he held, and as he dragged her into an alley garage with his hand over her mouth she left a trail of blood from her wound.

Meanwhile, someone had called police and reported seeing a woman being dragged into the alley. Detectives, uniformed officers, and members of the canine corps responded and followed the trail of blood to a garage in the 300 block of 11th Street, where they found the attack taking place.

Police said that as they came upon the pair Washington put \$24 he had taken from the woman back into her hand.

Police said Washington had been charged with raping two women in February and raping one of them a second time in May.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to thank my friend the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. MORSE. It is always a pleasure to cooperate with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Le Roy Morse
VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday, the White House sponsored another of its attempts to disguise the war in Vietnam to make it palatable to Members of Congress. All the same old dogmas were repeated, just as though nothing had changed since Mr. McNamara went over to Vietnam in October of 1963, and told us when he returned that things looked so good the boys would all be back home by 1965.

Ambassador Taylor went through his customary ritual of evading the entire issue of why and how the United States has flopped completely in the Taylor-inspired enterprise of aiding and advising the Vietnamese in a guerrilla war. The Taylor concept of fighting insurgencies has totally failed in Vietnam, under his guidance and direction. He has proved that the United States cannot win guerrilla wars, at least not under the policies of a Taylor. All we do is what we have done in South Vietnam, and that is to drop all pretense of helping one side, and making the war a western-style affair with large conventional American forces, including use of the Strategic Air Command.

Thanks to General Taylor and Secretary McNamara, the Communists have proved to the world that the United States cannot cope with insurgency on its

own terms, but can only fight it by turning a guerrilla war into a conventional one fought by American forces.

Of course, nothing of that kind was admitted at the White House yesterday. General Ky was pointed out to us as still being the titular head of South Vietnam. It is a largely honorary office, of course, and General Ky must always bear in mind what happened to President Diem when Henry Cabot Lodge arrived in Saigon as American Ambassador.

But the war is an American war. No longer do we advise; in fact, we give some status to the South Vietnamese Army as advisers. They are to conduct their end of war by being attached to American Army units to interpret and give us advice on how to proceed in relations with the local natives.

The recitation of how things are improving in Vietnam is a depressing thing to hear when a comparison with a year ago, or 2 years ago, or 4 years ago, or 10 years ago, shows only that the American position and the position of the South Vietnam Government have steadily eroded and deteriorated. It is a remarkable thing to be able to go up to the White House periodically and hear how things are improving when each visit is occasioned by a new step the United States has had to take in order to stabilize a deteriorating situation. It is an Alice-in-Wonderland exhibition of how the unpleasant can be evaded and the failures ignored.

POLITICAL FRAMEWORK OF WAR EFFORT BEING IGNORED

In light of this most recent exhibition, I have no hope or confidence whatever that the conventional war we are now undertaking in Vietnam under the same men who failed to win a guerrilla war, will have any more favorable result. For another element in the so-called briefings of the administration is a total vacuity on the political surroundings of the struggle itself.

It has been the ignorance of the politics of war that has brought us into this situation. But the same ignorance continues at the highest levels, and one need only report that no mention was made of the collapse of Malaysia at the White House briefings until the question was raised by a Senator.

To the administration, the war in Vietnam is a matter of military tactics. That is the sad but plain truth. We have based our policy there on nothing more than military tactics and we have been losing. We are continuing to base our policy there on military tactics and we are going to continue to lose.

Look at the map of Asia, at the famous dominoes. If the dominoes are falling, they are all falling on top of the United States. The Malaysian federation is collapsing. The American effort to hold up Vietnam as a bulwark against Communist expansion has been completely outflanked. All that were left of the dominoes on the Asian continent were Thailand, South Vietnam, and Malaysia. Now, it appears to be only a matter of weeks before the only ones will be Thailand and South Vietnam.

Press reports today indicate not only that Singapore expects to establish trade

19108

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 10, 1965

and diplomatic relations with Indonesia and China, but that other noncontiguous areas of Malaysia may very likely break away also. The disposition of the large British military installations in Singapore is in total abeyance, and there is already talk that Britain may abandon those installations and reestablish its defenses on Australia.

The implications of the dissolution of Malaysia brings into question the entire purpose of the American war in Vietnam. The ramifications are truly far reaching. Malaysia is still held up as a model of how guerrilla war can be fought and won. I have no quarrel with the model. But it is obviously no model for how a victory over guerrillas can be consolidated. It leaves totally unsolved the question of how a Western nation—be it Britain or the United States—can arrange to leave behind it an Asian political organization of its own choosing.

I do not suppose that the Malay peninsula itself will again become the battleground of a Communist insurgency. I pray it will not. But the failure of the various ethnic and widely scattered states to make a go of nationhood is not simply a victory for China or Indonesia, but a total defeat for the Western concept that governments of Asians can be controlled and manipulated to serve Western purposes.

Malaysia was an artificial state, created by Britain to serve British interests. In that respect, it was the Jordan of the Far East. Now, its wealthiest element is gone, and the racial balance that held the country together this long is destroyed. Indonesia, which is totally anti-West and pro-Chinese, has scored an undeniable political victory. Anyone who thinks that Sukarno is not going to be vastly more influential in Asian affairs as a result of these events is whistling past the graveyard. And anyone who thinks that the war in Vietnam is unaffected by these events, not to mention the events that may yet flow from them, is deluding himself.

Yet all this caused not an eyebrow to be raised down at the State Department. The Secretary of State did not even see fit to mention it in his turn at the briefing yesterday. When asked about it, he dismissed the whole affair as relatively insignificant. Obviously, the State Department, too, sees the war in Vietnam as one of military tactics. Its virtual resignation from its duties is a major reason why no large nation anywhere in the world has joined us in Vietnam. The Secretary of State is gratified that Thailand and the Ivory Coast are expressing verbal support for us. He is delighted that 36 flags are "with us" in Vietnam, although he neglects to mention that they do not fly over much more than 36 flagpoles.

Mr. President, he talks about some contribution from Australia. But, by and large, when the State Department talks about 36 flags flying in South Vietnam, the manpower those flags represent is insignificant.

I find no sense of feeling that we are getting any allied support by way of token support.

Let the American people also recognize that a vast propaganda drive has been directed toward those nations by the Government of the United States.

Let the American people understand that the Government of the United States has been putting great pressure upon government after government to give us at least some symbolic support in South Vietnam so that the Secretary of State can make the statement that we have so many flags there, that now there are 36 and it may very well go up to a larger number. But, the test so far as the mothers and fathers of America are concerned, and so far as the boys of America who are dying in South Vietnam are concerned, is how much manpower, muscle, and blood those flag poles represent in South Vietnam.

I am not going to be hoodwinked by State Department and Defense Department propaganda. Nor am I ever going to be silenced as a result of the deception of the State Department and the Defense Department in regard to their propaganda, short of a declaration of war.

Only when that war is made constitutional and the President and the Congress live up to their constitutional obligations by putting before the American people the issue as to whether or not we shall go to war, by way of a declaration of war, and such declaration is passed by Congress, will the lips of the senior Senator from Oregon ever be silenced in the continual plea for peaceful approaches to this threat of a third world war.

We are making history. I want my country to write a different chapter of history than it is writing now in respect to its absolutely inexcusable and illegal course of action in Asia. We stand not only in violation of the Constitution of the United States, but, in open violation of the Charter of the United Nations.

One must ask the administration, Where are India, Pakistan, Japan, and Indonesia?

These are the five great non-Communist powers that will dominate Asia for decades and decades to come. They oppose U.S. intervention in Asian affairs, and I include Japan because her people oppose it. I would have the American people remember my warning again today that if we continue this policy, no matter how many decades it takes for them to drive us out of Asia, they will eventually drive us out of Asia. We shall finally end reaching the negotiated settlement that we ought to seek to reach now without the sacrificing of thousands of Americans whom we are on the way to sacrifice in the months ahead, unless the American people say to this administration, "Halt your war in southeast Asia."

Only the American people are the remaining power that can stop this tramp, tramp, tramp to world war III, being led primarily by the United States.

So where are India, Pakistan, Japan, and Indonesia? There is not a mention of them from the Secretary of State, though they are the great powers of Asia. Canada, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands—where are they? No men-

tion of them either, although they are the great powers of Western Europe. Not even a mention of Great Britain, although she is the only significant country in the world that is actively supporting our activities in Vietnam, and now her support, too, is drawn deeply into question.

We reached the stage yesterday where the Secretary of State drew encouragement from the fact that Burma and Cambodia were not opposing us as bitterly at the moment as they have in the past. That is the most that can be said for the state of our relations among affected nations on the question of Vietnam.

ROLE OF UNITED NATIONS

The most depressing aspect of the administration's position is its continued failure to lay the Vietnam war before the United Nations. Some lipservice was given to our obligation to the Organization in recent weeks by the exchange of letters via Ambassador Goldberg. But they have been nothing but a buck-passing. They have sought to pass the buck to the Secretary General, U Thant.

In his capacity as Secretary General, U Thant has consistently reflected the position of his own country of Burma. He wants to be left alone in his neutralism. Like Burma, and like so many other new nations of Asia and Africa, Thant gives me the impression of having no capacity at all for dealing with the issues among the great powers. To him, the issues for the U.N. are those affecting emerging nations, particularly their economic and cultural development.

But problems of war and peace are too much for him, because the real threats to world peace are the conflicts among the United States and Russia or the United States and China.

Burma is a small country; like Cambodia and many of its other neighbors, it senses that it must accommodate to the prevailing presence of a large and powerful nation. It does not want to be torn apart, like Vietnam has been torn apart, by becoming a battleground for American and Chinese interests and conflicts.

U Thant reflects his country's position exactly. He appears to be afraid of great power issues, as are so many of the new nations and their representatives at the United Nations. To them, the U.N. is a place to come to condemn all Western countries, Communist and non-Communist alike, for the paucity of their economic aid. But it is not an organization to keep peace. That, in their view, must be done by the great powers.

If we take any question to the United Nations which might lead to giving more and more American money to more and more small nations, we get an enthusiastic response. However, when we take to the United Nations the issue of peace, involving the threat to peace which exists because of the conflict that has developed among the great powers of the world, the small nations want to be left alone.

We cannot justify leaving any member of the United Nations alone, in respect

August 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19109

to its clear treaty obligations to follow a course of action through procedures of the United Nations that will help create and enforce peace.

This is why I have been heard to say before that the only advantage to the great powers of the U.N. is its peace-keeping function. If it fails this mission, then the U.N. has little value for the United States, or for the Soviet Union, or Western Europe, either.

It is traditional to have a Secretary General from a relatively neutral country. But the Secretaries General from Norway and Sweden were not afraid to tackle the big issues. They may have felt themselves above the battle in terms of their personal views, but they never felt above the great power battles in terms of the function of that organization.

So we heard it said at the White House that the United States had asked the U.N. and U Thant to make any contributions they could to the settlement of the war, and they had come up with nothing. I do not know why they think U Thant would come up with anything, anyway. He never has exercised any capacity for dealing with issues that have threatened world peace. I think he prefers not to have the United Nations exercise any peacekeeping function at all.

That is the position of many new nations. They want China and Russia, and the United States to settle their differences between themselves and leave the new nations out of it.

What will befall all these bystanders if Russia and China and the United States fail to settle their differences peacefully—as we have failed in Vietnam—is something they prefer not to think about.

They prefer not to consider what will happen to Burma and Cambodia if the war in Vietnam continues to escalate, and results in a massive war between the United States and China or between the United States on one side, and China and Russia on the other.

But whatever the inadequacies of the Secretary General to deal with the main purpose of the United Nations, the United States has no out in leaving the matter up to him. We are a party to the dispute in Vietnam, and as such we have clear and definite obligations under the U.N. Charter to lay such a dispute before the Security Council. U Thant is not a party to the dispute; other U.N. members are not parties to the dispute. But we are. And as such, article 37 applies directly to us. How many times in the last 2 years have I read this article and other articles of the charter to the Senate? How many times during the last 2 years have I pointed out that, after all, the procedure for laying this threat to the peace of the world before the Security Council is a very simple procedure. All the President needs to do is to instruct his Ambassador to send a letter to the current President of the Security Council, asking for a meeting to consider the threat to the peace in Vietnam. It is that simple. We do not even have to propose a solution, or a particular U.N. action.

Listen again to article 37. It states:

Should the parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in article 33 fail to settle

it by the means indicated in that article, they shall refer it to the Security Council.

There is nothing permissive about that language; it is mandatory language. The United States has failed to carry out the mandate of article 37 of the charter, and therefore stands in violation of it.

We are constantly being told that we are not the only violator. Of course not. The Communists violate it, too. But that is some company to be keeping.

Mr. President, it does not make any difference, so far as our legal obligations are concerned, how many other nations are also violators. We profess to stand for an order of law. We ought to practice our professions.

So I say all the letters to U Thant asking him to help us bring North Vietnam to the negotiating table will not fulfill that American obligation under article 37.

Today's New York Times reports:

The search for a Vietnam peace formula undertaken by six Security Council members has reached a standstill, diplomatic sources said tonight.

The story indicates that the six nonpermanent members of the Security Council were divided on whether Vietnam should be made the subject of debate.

The six nations are Jordan, Malaysia, Netherlands, Ivory Coast, Bolivia, and Uruguay.

The New York Times story continues:

Privately, some diplomats have expressed irritation that the United States has placed the Council members in an impossible situation. They complain that, without asking for a debate, the United States has seemed to be expecting some action from the Council and they do not see what the Council usefully can do at the moment.

Of course, what the Security Council can usefully do at the moment is to fulfill its obligations under the United Nations Charter to take under consideration threats to the peace. That is what it is there for. In fact, that is all in the world it is there for.

I should like to say to those members of the Security Council, the nonpermanent as well as the permanent members, "Each and every one of you has the clear legal obligation to raise the matter before the Security Council. The fact that you have not, or, if it is true as the New York Times story seems to indicate, you are not anxious to, my country, as a beligerent, under article XXXVII has a clear duty to raise it."

We have walked out on that obligation.

The Security Council has no other function, I say, under the United Nations Charter. If it is unwilling or afraid even to debate the greatest threat to peace which exists in the world today, then I suggest that it disband and that its members go home and stop pretending to be representatives of the United Nations.

The Security Council, the Secretary General, and the United States of America are trying to outdo each other in the passing of the buck. Among them, they are signing the death warrant of the United Nations. It already has little enough international respect without this

game of musical chairs over the question of who has the first responsibility.

They all have a responsibility which they are failing to live up to. Their failure must be the despair of mankind.

But as a U.S. Senator, I have no control or authority over the actions of the Secretary General or the other members of the Security Council. I do have a voice, however small, in the Government of the United States, and I shall continue raising it to demand that the United States not proceed further into this Asian war in disregard and in disobedience to the solemn treaty which we signed in 1945.

I am not interested in the feeble excuses offered by this administration, which are no more than the feeble excuses for the past 2 years that U Thant has not come up with any ideas. U Thant is not the idea man of the U.S. Government. We are supposed to have people in our own Government with ideas, and I hope we have one or two left somewhere who still have the idea that the United States ought to live up to its U.N. Charter obligations.

Oh, we are told that delicate negotiations must be undertaken on a private basis among members of the Security Council to work out some course of action that can produce progress. Well, that is normal procedure. But why have we been fighting a war for 4 years, and only now saying that some delicate negotiations would be necessary before we could go to the U.N.?

It is obvious that even now we have not made any decision to seek United Nations jurisdiction, because if we had, we would be engaged in such negotiations ourselves and would not be leaving the matter up to U Thant and to the six nonpermanent members of the Security Council. If we were intending to fulfill our obligations under the charter, we would be deeply engaged in negotiating with other members of the Security Council on taking up the Vietnam problem and working out some possible action for the Council to take.

My question is, What does our administration have to say about article 37? How long is it going to be willing to follow a policy that is every bit as much in violation of the charter as was the Soviet Union in Hungary? Indeed, our record in Vietnam shows that we are making war with as much disregard for the United Nations as are the Vietcong and North Vietnam.

When he was majority leader, the Senator from Texas, now President of the United States, was renowned for refusing to let anything come to a vote until he had worked out some compromise that he knew would guarantee success. We hear that policy applied now to the Security Council, and the public is told by the Secretary of State that it would be embarrassing to the United States to have an acrimonious debate at the Security Council and a veto of a proposed course of action.

But this can only mean the administration is not embarrassed at being an outlaw nation under the charter. It can only mean that we are less embarrassed at embarking on war in violation of our treaty commitment to the U.N. than we

19110

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 10, 1965

would be at having a U.N. peace move turned down.

This is nothing but doubletalk. It is pure doubletalk to say that we cannot go to the U.N. until everything is worked out in advance. We are not even trying to work anything out. We have only asked U Thant and other members for some ideas.

The United Nations is not the U.S. Senate; and a conflagration in Asia is not a piece of proposed legislation in the American Congress. Surely even the former majority leader would not be embarrassed to be vetoed in the United Nations on a sincere peace proposal.

I know the sotto voce argument that is being made. It is that relations with the Soviet Union are at stake, and if we press anything at the U.N. without prior Soviet approval, we will only exacerbate other pending issues with Russia, such as disarmament.

In my judgment, that is a complete non sequitur. I find it hard to understand the argument that we must not do anything to put Russia on the spot. I am for putting Russia on the spot. For 2 years, I have urged putting Russia on the spot. I have urged my Government to take this issue to Russia in the Security Council—and to France, too. No one knows what the position of France would be in the Security Council. We should find out which nation, if any, in the Security Council is not willing to observe the peacekeeping obligations of the charter. I do not buy the argument that that would make it difficult for Russia in regard to her relations with China.

It is important that we make clear to Russia that we think Russia and the United States should each and both assume their obligations under the United Nations.

That is a good lesson for China also.

No, Mr. President, I have never bought the argument of the Department of State that we must not proceed because it would mean in effect that being a law-abiding nation and keeping our obligations might make it difficult for poor Russia.

Such an argument would be almost humorous if it were not such a tragedy. It would be almost humorous if it were not for the fact our failure to prosecute to the maximum extent possible our obligation under the procedures of the United Nations involves the killing of American boys.

I find myself aghast at the statements of spokesmen for this administration that we have got to continue as we are for the time being. For that "time being" and for that period, I say that many American boys are going to die—and not only American boys, but thousands of other human beings.

I am aghast that so many persons seem to think that because political ideology of a group of human beings is not liked, it is all right with God to kill them. Every human being is a creature of God, and every human being is a child of God. I cannot reconcile this philosophy of this administration, at least with the religious teachings on which I was nurtured in the development of my spiritual beliefs.

I believe we have a clear moral and spiritual obligation to follow our obligations under the charter to which our country has affixed its signature; that we ought at least to exhaust all the procedures available to us in an endeavor to reach peace through the application of the procedures of international law before we accelerate a war which will lead to the killing of increasing numbers of human beings on each side of that war, undeclared and illegal, in the months ahead, while apparently we wait for U Thant to come up with an idea that would lead us to peace.

In my judgment, we shall wait a long time, and the blood will flow in streams, before we get a solution through the present policies of the United States in the United Nations.

Our relations with the Soviet Union are already poisoned by the war in Vietnam. The Soviets have already put into the deep freeze almost every subject under discussion between our countries. They are using the disarmament discussions as a forum to attack us for our war in Vietnam.

Each escalation of the war in Vietnam will see a further deterioration in our relations with the Soviet Union. The more we put into the war against North Vietnam, the more the Soviet Union is obliged to come to their aid. Keeping the war out of the U.N. so that we can fight it unencumbered by opinions that might be expressed there is only another case of ignoring the political surroundings of the whole issue in southeast Asia.

If the war continues on its present course, and the escalations by the United States are matched by North Vietnam, and ultimately by China, we shall not have anything more to worry about in our relations with the Soviet Union because she will be a belligerent on the other side.

So I am astonished, and I fear much of the world is astonished, to hear the Secretary of State say that for an American-sponsored peace proposal to be vetoed at the U.N. would be embarrassing to the United States. Apparently, to the State Department it is another case of saving face. But the face of peace does not need saving. To make a bona fide peace proposal to the Security Council, whether it is vetoed or not, will save a lot more face for the United States than more war in violation of the U.N. Charter will save.

CONGRESS MUST REMAIN IN SESSION

I restate to the American people today that they must make clear to the Members of Congress that it is their job to stay on the job until January 1, when the 2d session of the 89th Congress will convene.

The administration is presenting us with sophistries and excuses for the prosecution of the war.

The only conclusion that can be drawn from the briefing given Congress yesterday is that the war will continue as before for some time. The President has already counted the days that Congress will be out of Washington, assuming it leaves on Labor Day. He is willing that the war be prosecuted at existing levels during that time, while we give U Thant

a chance to persuade North Vietnam to negotiate.

We do not plan to make the job any easier by halting the bombing or by easing our own war effort. But we would give U Thant 116 days to make a peace in Vietnam.

After that, when Congress returns in January, I am satisfied that the American war in Asia will be put into high gear. That is the warning that I issue to the American people today.

I urge the American people to make perfectly clear to Members of Congress that they should remain in session all this fall to carry out their constitutional obligation to be available at all times to exercise constitutional checks upon the President, the State Department, and the Department of Defense in connection with the prosecution of the war in Vietnam.

I am not asking for any sacrifices from Members of Congress. They are all well paid. I do not know of any of us who is underpaid. We ought to earn our money. We will not be earning our money in days of great national emergency when we are outside Washington.

The major business of the Government, as far as the vital interest of the people of this country is concerned, happens to be the war in southeast Asia.

My advice to Members of the Congress is that they will find, if they adjourn sine die on Labor Day, or shortly thereafter, large numbers of their constituents will want to know why they are back home and why they are not in Washington attending to the business of Congress in connection with its responsibility to maintain its congressional checks under our form of government, in days of emergency, upon the executive branch of the Government.

I am satisfied that if we follow a program of adjourning sine die on September 1, and coming back 116 days later, that then the national emergency will be declared. Reservists and Guardsmen will be called up and all the statutory powers that come into play upon the calling of a national emergency will be exercised. The United States will be placed on a war footing that will be entirely comparable to that which existed during the Korean war.

I base that judgment and opinion on the fact that, unless we remain in session and do what we can to check the escalation of that war, preparation for the escalation will go on. As the preparations continue, we are more and more endangered of returning in January only to be faced with an accomplished fact.

I also predict that all of this will take place without the United States ever once laying the war before the United Nations in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

After that, there will be no turning back, and there will be no effort to seek United Nations or other third party negotiation. After that, it will be a war to the end, but to the end of what, the White House briefing does not yet say.

Under the best possible circumstances, the use of a million or so U.S. troops could suppress the Vietcong. That assumes that North Vietnam does no more

August 10, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300130016-8

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19111

than she is doing now to help them, and it assumes that neither China nor Russia steps up their aid to the Vietcong.

These are assumptions that are a million-to-one shot. I do not believe for a minute that North Vietnam, China, or Russia will limit their aid to the Vietcong to current levels when we increase our participation.

I warn the American people that they and their Congress are being prepared for an all-out war in Asia. That is what it will be, if third parties do not succeed in achieving negotiations before the end of this year. We are being prepared for the sending of hundreds of thousands of our forces into southeast Asia, where they will die like flies unless China and North Vietnam and Russia do us the favor of staying out of a war that is being fought on their doorstep.

Even if they do stay out, what are the prospects for the future? What are the chances that South Vietnam can ever maintain itself as an independent nation? The example of Malaysia darkens what was already a very dim outlook. Malaysia was an artificial creation, just as South Vietnam is an artificial creation. I do not believe that the United States will do any better with its handiwork than Britain has done.

Eventually we, too, will be faced with the necessity of drawing our military outposts back out of the Asian mainland to areas where our way of life not only is better understood and received than it is on the mainland of Asia, but also where it is politically and militarily more defensible.

The United Nations could help us to do that. But the Strategic Air Command and a million American marines will never help us remain on the Asian mainland. They will only swell the number of Asians who will fight to the death to drive us out.

The American people had better start warning Congress to remain in session this fall. They had better begin to communicate to their representatives in Congress whether they contemplate a costly, long-term Asian war in their future and in the future of their children.

The administration has served warning on Congress that it is eager to see it leave town so that the war can proceed and the halfhearted efforts to encourage someone else to find a negotiated settlement can remain undisturbed in their present rut until January.

The administration desires to be free of criticism during that period so that when Congress returns in January, the administration can say that all peace efforts have failed and there is nothing to do but to make a real war out of it. That is the prospect. Only the American people can change the course of the war in Asia. The time remaining for changing the course of the war is fast running out.

Mr. President, I close by making the same suggestion that I have made over and over again for 2 years. The United States, through its Ambassador, should send a letter to the Security Council of the United Nations in accordance with the procedures of the charter itself, which we signed, in which we should ask that there be laid before the Security

Council, for its jurisdiction, the threat to the peace in Asia and the world which has been created by the warmaking that is going on in Vietnam. We should make clear in that letter that we will cooperate with the Security Council in carrying out whatever peacekeeping policies are agreed upon by the Council for bringing an end to the war and substituting the force necessary, on a multilateral basis, to keep the peace.

Those forces will occupy an entirely different status. They will not be warmaking forces. They will be peacekeeping forces. True, they will fight if fired upon, just as similar United Nations peacekeeping forces in the Gaza strip have functioned for years and prevented, in the Middle East, an outbreak of a major war; just as the United Nations forces now on Cyprus are functioning to keep the peace. They are not there to make war. However, they will respond if fired upon.

The same procedure was followed by the United Nations peacekeeping force in the Congo when the United Nations moved into the Congo.

We have other examples, but of a lesser degree, in which the Security Council has intervened to keep the peace when there was a growing threat of breach of the peace.

This is the course of action I plead that my Nation follow. This is the course of action which is the treaty obligation of my Nation. It is this course of action that my Nation has defied ever since it has been making war in Asia, seeking to alibi its action on the ground that the Communist nations, too, are making war. That fact does not change the fact that we are a member of the U.N. and an open violator of its charter.

So I say most respectfully to my President, for whom I have great admiration personally, and with whom I find myself in agreement on most issues, but completely in disagreement with respect to this aspect of our foreign policy, "Change your instructions to Ambassador Goldberg." Stop making him a letter carrier. Send him back to the United Nations with a resolution to be submitted in behalf of the Republic of the United States and its people to the United Nations, asking the United Nations, through the Security Council, to formally take jurisdiction over the threat to world peace in southeast Asia, and carry out its obligations to maintain peace in this area of the world, where a war is going on that may very well develop into a nuclear war that will endanger the survival of most of mankind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an article from this morning's New York Times entitled "U.N. Peace Hunt at a Standstill," written by Kathleen Teltsch; another article from this morning's New York Times entitled "Singapore Plans To Seek Accords With Communists," by Seymour Topping; and another article from this morning's New York Times entitled "Britain Assesses Singapore's Move—Review of Defense Accord With Malaysia Indicated." These are articles that I cite as background

supporting material for some of the observations in my speech.

I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD statements and the program of the Assembly of Unrepresented People that met in Washington to protest the war in Vietnam.

There being no objection, the articles and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 10, 1965]
U.N. PEACE HUNT AT A STANDSTILL—SIX COUNCIL MEMBERS SPLIT ON FULL DEBATE OF VIETNAM

(By Kathleen Teltsch)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., August 9.—The search for a Vietnam peace formula undertaken by six Security Council members has reached a standstill, diplomatic sources said tonight.

Private negotiations will go on, these sources said. However, it was reported that the six were split on whether the Vietnam issue should be aired at an open, formal meeting of the Council.

The six—Jordan, Malaysia, the Netherlands, Ivory Coast, Bolivia, and Uruguay—began their private talks in response to a letter July 30 from Arthur J. Goldberg, the U.S. delegate. This letter did not ask for a Council session but appealed to members to help find an acceptable solution and was taken up by some states as compelling them to respond.

The Soviet Union is known to have been sounded out by at least one of the six over the weekend, but a delegation source would say only that the Soviet attitude was not very encouraging.

In considering a U.N. debate, at least some members expressed reluctance to see the Council summoned because it would precipitate a Soviet-American clash. Others have insisted that they have a commitment to fulfill and should seek a meeting, regardless of this possibility.

IRRITATION EXPRESSED

Privately, some diplomats have expressed irritation that the United States has placed the Council members in an impossible position. They complain that, without asking for a debate, the United States has seemed to be expecting some action from the Council and they do not see what the Council can usefully do at the moment.

Disputing this view, a U.S. spokesman has indicated that the intention was to put the matter "in the lap of the Council," not with the idea that it would act at once but that it would gear itself for future needs.

As an alternative to a formal debate with its dangers of cold-war wrangling, some of the six Council members hope for private negotiations either by Secretary General Thant or by outside mediation efforts. However, a diplomatic source said Mr. Thant had indicated that he saw no immediate prospect of following up the initiatives he has made in the past, which have been rejected by one side or the other.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 10, 1965]
UNITED STATES DENIES IT REJECTED BID

WASHINGTON, August 9.—The State Department denied today that the Johnson administration rejected last fall a proposal by North Vietnam for peace talks aimed at ending the Vietnam war.

"We are not aware of any initiative that could have been described as a bid for peace talks," said the State Department press officer, Robert J. McCloskey, at a news conference.

He had been asked for comment on an article published by the New York Herald Tribune Sunday that said such a Communist

19112

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 10, 1965

peace overture was made through a non-Communist Asian diplomat and was rejected by the administration.

Mr. McCloskey was then asked about reported Communist approaches through Secretary General Thant and through Adlai E. Stevenson, the late U.S. delegate to the United Nations.

"There had been reports of feelers and soundings," Mr. McCloskey said. "We have had contacts through third parties, but were not satisfied we had ever received a bid for peace talks."

[From the New York Times, Aug. 10, 1965]

SINGAPORE PLANS TO SEEK ACCORDS WITH COMMUNISTS—BUT NEW INDEPENDENT STATE WILL CONTINUE COOPERATION WITH BRITAIN IN DEFENSE—INDONESIAN TIE WEIGHED—SECESSION FROM FEDERATION LAID TO TENSION BETWEEN CHINESE AND MALAYS

(By Seymour Topping)

SINGAPORE, August 9.—Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew declared today that newly independent Singapore would cooperate with Britain in defense matters, but would seek new understandings with Communist countries and with Indonesia.

The Prime Minister said Singapore wanted trade ties with all Communist countries, would accept a trade mission from the Soviet Union and was ready to reestablish consular relations with Indonesia. He made these arrangements conditional on respect for Singapore's sovereignty.

The 43-year-old Prime Minister, who is of Chinese parentage, made his policy statement during a tearful explanation of the weekend events that resulted in the surprise withdrawal of Singapore from the Federation of Malaysia at 12:01 a.m. today and its establishment as an independent nation.

RELATIONS STRAINED

The secession has put a severe strain on relations between the three remaining members of the Federation of Malaysia, which was founded September 16, 1963, under the aegis of the British Commonwealth.

The remaining members are Malaya and the Borneo States of Sarawak and Sabah. Indonesia, in a militant "crush Malaysia" policy has sought to detach the Borneo States, which are defended by more than 7,000 Commonwealth troops, from the Malay-dominated federation government in Kuala Lumpur.

Speaking at a televised news conference in an emotion-choaked voice, Prime Minister Lee asserted that the Malay Government had forced the secession of his island state of 2 million people, predominantly Chinese. He said that Prince Abdul Rahman, the Malay leader who is Prime Minister of the Federation of Malaysia, had indicated that communal strife might explode between Chinese and Malays if Singapore insisted on remaining in the federation.

In Kuala Lumpur, Prime Minister Rahman said he had found it impossible in secret talks Saturday and yesterday to reach agreement with Prime Minister Lee.

"Obviously," he said, "the present setup could not go on."

The Prince has been under strong pressure from ultra-nationalist Malay leaders of his Alliance party to take militant action to block efforts of Mr. Lee to expand his political influence from Singapore into the rest of the federation.

The ultranationalists have interpreted Mr. Lee's activities as a challenge by the Chinese residents to Malay political paramountcy.

COMMUNAL VIOLENCE FEARED

Prince Rahman, who has sought to moderate the quarrel, noted in a speech this morning before the Malaysian Parliament that irresponsible people, "unfortunately from both sides," had been making utterances that might cause a communal holocaust.

The Malaysian police in Singapore, now transferred to the control of Prime Minister Lee, reinforced patrols tonight in Geylang and other sensitive areas of the city where rioting last year between Malays and Chinese resulted in the killing and wounding of hundreds. No serious incidents were reported.

Singapore's population is 75 percent Chinese and 12 percent Malay, Indians, Pakistanis and Ceylonese, who make up about 10 percent, and the rest, mostly Eurasians, have not been directly in communal tensions.

Prime Minister Lee appealed tonight to the Malay population to remain calm.

"We shall be united regardless of race, religion, or culture," he said. "We are going to have a multiracial nation. We shall set the example."

Under the Independence of Singapore Agreement, reached between the Government at Kuala Lumpur and Singapore, there will be close cooperation in matters of commerce and defense between the two states. However, passports soon will be required to pass over the causeway that links the island of Singapore with Malaya.

Singapore is obligated under the agreement to continue to afford to the British Government bases on the 217-square-mile island "for the purposes of assisting in the defense of Singapore and Malaysia and for Commonwealth defense and for the preservation of peace in southeast Asia."

The British maintain their Far East military headquarters in Singapore under the command of Air Chief Marshal Sir John Grandy. They also operate the Changi Air Base and the Singapore Naval Base.

MOVE SURPRISED AMERICANS

The secession announcement made in Singapore and Kuala Lumpur shortly after 10 o'clock this morning, produced stunned reactions throughout Malaysia. British officials had only a few hours' notice and American officials were caught completely by surprise.

In Kuching, the Sarawak Government announced after an emergency Cabinet meeting that Singapore's secession would "not in any way affect our policy and position within Malaysia." The Sabah Government reserved comment until the return of Peter Lo, the Chief Minister, from Kuala Lumpur.

Political observers were dubious that the federation would survive the shock of Singapore's withdrawal. Apart from the pressures exerted by Indonesia through the threat of guerrilla raids, Singapore's secession upset the political balance that pulled the federation through past crises. With the two million Singaporeans out, the Malays have become heavily preponderant over the indigenous peoples of the Borneo States.

One of the aims of the Malay leaders in forcing Singapore out had been to overtake the Chinese, who had gained a slight edge in numbers in the total Malaysian population of about 10 million.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Aug. 10, 1965]

RAHMAN CITES TENSIONS

(By Seth S. King)

KUALA LUMPUR, MALAYSIA, August 9.—Prince Abdul Rahman told a stunned House of Representatives today that Singapore was being "separated" from the Federation of Malaysia because it was impossible to go on working with the ethnic Chinese leaders of the island state.

Both houses of the Malaysian Parliament voted later, without opposition, to reject Singapore and recognize her as an independent country.

The move came as a complete surprise. Even the British upon whom Malaysia is almost totally dependent for protection against Indonesia, were not told of the plan until

last night. Prime Minister Rahman said some of his own Cabinet members did not know about the move until today.

Prime Minister Rahman said the decision was made by a small group of Government leaders Friday night, a day after he returned from 2 months abroad. On Saturday, Prime Minister Lee was summoned to Kuala Lumpur. An agreement on separation was signed that night.

RELATIONS HAD DETERIORATED

Prime Minister Rahman told Parliament that relations between Kuala Lumpur and Singapore had become so bad that he had had only two courses of action open. One to take "repressive measures" against the leaders of the Singapore government. The other was to amend the constitution and drop Singapore from the federation.

"I believe the second course of action is the right one, sad as it may be," he said. "We had pledged to form Malaysia with Singapore. But having given it a trial, we found that if we persisted in going on with it there would be more trouble to Malaysia than what Singapore is worth to us."

CHALLENGES BY KUALA LUMPUR

In recent months the People's Action Party, led by Prime Minister Lee and centered in Singapore, had been challenging the multi-racial Central Government on many issues. Mr. Lee had become the principal spokesman for the scattered small parties making up the opposition.

The disagreements had an undertone of racial discord between the Malays and the ethnic Chinese.

In a speech following Prince Rahman's, Tan Siew Sin, an ethnic Chinese who serves as Minister of Finance, said:

"A Chinese-Malaya clash in Malaysia, with the two races roughly equal in numbers and in many places inextricably mixed, would have been the kind of holocaust beside which racial riots in other countries would be a mere picnic."

Singapore and Kuala Lumpur agreed to continue cooperation in economic affairs "for their mutual benefit." They also agreed to establish a joint defense council.

Singapore will now be free to conduct her own foreign affairs. At a news conference Prince Rahman said Malaysia would sponsor Singapore's application for membership in the United Nations and the British Commonwealth.

At present, Singapore is economically self-sufficient. But her promising industrial growth has been based on the prospect of a Malaysian common market in which Singapore's goods would be sold without duty in the three other states. Singapore is also totally dependent on reservoirs in Malaya for her water supply.

One clause of the separation agreement stipulates that neither Singapore nor Kuala Lumpur will sign treaties or other agreements affecting both without the agreement of the other state.

This, in theory, would prevent Singapore from unilaterally making peace with Indonesia or signing a treaty with Communist China.

But Mr. Lee faces a Pelping-oriented opposition that could, now that the Malaysian plan has been overturned, seriously threaten the People's Action Party's control of the Government.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 10, 1965]

BRITAIN ASSESSES SINGAPORE'S MOVE—REVIEW OF DEFENSE ACCORD WITH MALAYSIA INDICATED

LONDON, August 9.—Singapore's decision to leave the Malaysian federation thrust a wide range of problems at Britain today.

It called into question Britain's defense agreement with Malaysia, British policy in the area and Singapore's relationship with Britain as a member of the Commonwealth.

August 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19113

Although many of the members of the government were on holiday when the news came, the Commonwealth Relations Office said it had been informed of Singapore's decision in advance.

[Radhakrishna Ramafil, the Malaysian representative at the United Nations, was stunned when he heard a radio report of Singapore's secession. Later, at his office, he found a cablegram from his government instructing him to advise the Secretary General, U Thant, of the move.]

WILSON ON VACATION

There was no indication that Prime Minister Wilson, on holiday in the islands off Britain, was planning to return to London.

Arthur Bottomley, Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations, was in Accra, Ghana, and Michael Stewart, the Foreign Secretary, left for the Scilly Islands today.

Despite the statement by the Commonwealth Relations Office, it was believed that any advance notice had come only hours before the announcement from Singapore.

DEFENSE PACT TO BE STUDIED

The office said Britain's defense agreement with Malaysia "and possibly other aspects of our relations may have to be reconsidered, but we cannot say anything definite or indicate what changes, if any, may be needed until the matter has been considered in detail."

One of the "other aspects" of relations with Singapore, which has been associated with Britain since 1819, when it was ceded to the British East India Co. through the efforts of Sir Stamford Raffles, is whether Singapore will remain in the Commonwealth, of which Malaysia is a member. Observers here assumed that Singapore would want to remain.

The big problem is Britain's defense policy in Malaysia as it pertains to Indonesia, which contends Malaysia was set up by Britain as a device to encircle and eventually overwhelm her. Indonesia has sent guerrillas into Malaysia and fierce clashes have ensued. British troops have helped Malaysia under the defense pact.

Late tonight the Commonwealth Relations Office issued a statement announcing British recognition of Singapore as an independent state.

Britain's interest in eventually shifting her strategic base in the Far East from Singapore to Australia was viewed here as having received strong new impetus from Singapore's secession.

The British base is now an economic necessity for Singapore, whose trade with Indonesia has stopped.

The secession agreement provides for the continuation of the base.

But observers believe that if Indonesia recognizes Singapore's independence, as seems likely, trade will be resumed so that ultimately the base will not be so important to Singapore's economy.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 10, 1965]
AUSTRALIANS DISMAYED

SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA, August 9.—News of Singapore's withdrawal from Malaysia was greeted with dismay today by Australians.

It was feared that the break would weaken the capacity of both Singapore and Malaysia to resist Indonesian pressure and make more difficult Australia's commitment to assist them militarily and economically.

Paul M. C. Hasluck, Minister for External Affairs, issued a statement in Canberra expressing regret that the union "had not worked out" but voicing the hope that "there security and stability would remain sound."

Australia has dispatched a battalion of troops and air force and naval units to help protect Malaysian territories from Indonesia and has also been providing economic aid.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 10, 1965]

JAPANESE SURPRISED

TOKYO, August 9.—Singapore's secession caused surprise and concern in the Foreign Ministry and in some business quarters here.

Foreign Ministry sources said there seemed to be no legal problems involved in Japan's recognizing Singapore as an independent state. But they said Japan faced further difficulties in her efforts to mediate the dispute between Malaysia and Indonesia.

The sources said Japan's business ventures in the region might feel major effects from the secession, depending on the future course of economic relations between Malaysia and Singapore.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 10, 1965]

UNITED STATES WEIGHS RECOGNITION

WASHINGTON, August 9.—The State Department has under consideration recognition of Singapore as an independent nation.

U.S. officials privately expressed concern that the secession would weaken Malaysia's capacity to resist Indonesia incursions. This concern was heightened with the news that Singapore would follow a neutral policy and recognize both Indonesia and Communist China.

ASSEMBLY OF UNREPRESENTED PEOPLE

This assembly does not contain representatives. Nobody has been elected to it. It might be better called an assembly for unrepresented people.

We hope people who take part in workshops will talk about the work they are doing or would like to do. We think there are a lot of people doing good work that other people do not know about. We hope the assembly will help these people find out about each other. We hope they will discuss concrete ways in which they can support each other. We hope that groups who already have plans for the late summer and fall will circulate them so that other people can see how they can support them. We hope new programs will come from some of the workshops.

HOUSING

If you do not have housing tell a registrar. There will be a central registration table at the Sylvan Theater (indicated by X on the map) Saturday and Sunday. There will be a registrar at each workshop.

At the registration desk a card with your host's name, address, and telephone number will be given you. Call your host and tell him when you are coming. Get directions to his house. The host is expected to give you a place to sleep. You must provide your own food.

For those who can afford it, housing is available at: Gauntt House, 1716 North Street NW., HU 3-9791, \$2 per night. Cairo Hotel, 1615 Q Street NW., HO 2-2104, \$6 per night (double).

FRIDAY, AUGUST 6, SCHEDULE

The 4-day Assembly of Unrepresented People begins with a solemn, silent, unmoving vigil line in front of the White House in prayerful commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima.

At 11 a.m.: Assemble in front of White House (registration). Watch for wandering registrars with armbands.

Noon: Silent prayer vigil in front of White House.

At 12:30: Mass meeting at the Federal Office Building or in Lafayette Square across from White House.

Speakers: (1) Joan Baez; (2) Rabbi Feinstein; (3) Robert Parris; (4) A. J. Muste and others.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 7, WASHINGTON MONUMENT

At 9 to 11 a.m.: Assemble at Sylvan Theater (on the Monument Grounds) for folksing. (Registration will also be at this time. Register at information table by Sylvan Theater or with roving registrars.) (Refer to map X, not printed in the Record.)

At 11 to 12: Lunch break (bag lunches will be sold in the area).

At 12 to 6 p.m.: Workshops (number indicates location, see map).

1. The House Un-American Activities Committee.

2. Washington, D.C.: Area problems.

3. Apartheid in South Africa.

4. ———

5. Dominican Republic.

6. Conscientious objection to war.

7. Religion and social action.

8. Puerto Rico.

9. ———

10. The congressional challenge and the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party.

11. Community organization.

12. Free university.

13. Free student union.

14. ———

15. ———

At 8 to 10 p.m.: Possible regional meetings in area churches.

WASHINGTON MONUMENT, SUNDAY, AUGUST 8

At 9 to 11: Folk-sing at Sylvan Theater on the monument grounds.

At 11 to 12: Lunch break (lunches will be sold in area).

At 12 to 5: Constituency workshops. (Letters designate areas on map.)

A. Community people: (7) Union members; (8) unorganized labor; (9) community organizers; (—) Housewives (next to 9).

B. Academic community: (1) College faculty; (2) high school teachers; (6) grade school teachers.

C. Student community: (3) High school students; (5) college and university students.

D. Other: (10) Folk singers; (11) doctors; (12) lawyers; (13) labor organizers and labor people; (14) writers, artists; (15) peace workers and peace people.

At 7 p.m.: Meeting of all participants with reports from all the workshops. The agenda for the assembly on August 9 will also be decided on at this meeting. Any action to be taken on Monday will be the decision of the assembly on Sunday night. Place of meeting will be announced Saturday morning.

MONDAY, AUGUST 9

At 11 a.m.: Assemble at area to be designated Sunday night. Declarations of peace will be read on this day.

DECLARATION OF PEACE, AUGUST 9, 1965

Because for 20 years the people of Vietnam have been tortured, burned, and killed; because their land and crops have been ruined and their culture has been destroyed; and because we refuse to have these things done in our name, we declare peace with the people of Vietnam.

Because millions of Americans had hoped and expected that their votes in the 1964 presidential election would move our country away from war toward peace, and because these hopes and expectations have been betrayed in Vietnam, we declare peace with the people of Vietnam.

Because the Congress of the United States, without adequate discussion, has permitted the waging of an undeclared war, we symbolically assume its responsibility for this day in the name of those people of the United States and of the world who oppose this war, and declare peace with the people of Vietnam.

Because we believe that the steady escalation of the war in Vietnam threatens all people with nuclear death, we declare peace with the people of Vietnam.

19114

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 10, 1965

Because we believe that people all over the world must find ways to make peace with each other and to keep their governments from ever waging war, we declare peace with the people of Vietnam.

We commit ourselves to a continuing effort to implement this declaration of peace.

You are invited to write a declaration of your own.

In case of emergency, call: Washington Summer Action, 819 Independence Avenue SE., phone: 543-2203.

Mr. MORSE. I yield the floor.

THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 will be administered under regulations issued by the Office of Education. I understand draft regulations have been circulated to State superintendents of schools and others, discussed at local meetings throughout the country, and that final regulations may soon be issued by the Secretary.

I am deeply concerned that under these regulations a principal purpose of the act—to lift the quality of education in the neediest school districts, those having the largest proportion of children from low-income families—may not be met. I am worried that the funds provided by the act may be diverted from the first priority needs of these districts. Supplemental projects, however desirable, are not fundamental it seems to me, and in many of these neglected areas should follow and build upon improvements made in the regular, basic educational program.

I understand that representatives of the Office of Education have reiterated and emphasized that the act is not a general aid-to-education bill, is not a school construction bill, and is not a teacher salary bill.

It is true that the formula in the act is directed to school attendance areas having large numbers of "educationally deprived children"—defined as those from low-income families. For example, title I of the act contains in section 205 (a) the requirement that payments will be used for programs and projects "designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children in school attendance areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families."

But section 205(a) also requires that these programs and projects be of "sufficient size, scope, and quality to give reasonable promise of substantial progress toward meeting those needs." In many districts, I believe that requirement would comprehend a general improvement in the regular school program.

I can understand that in a comparatively wealthy State such as New York or California—where the numbers of children from poor families in any school district may amount to 4, 5, or 6 percent, or even 12 or 14 percent, of those in the school district—the purposes of the act can best be accomplished by designing special projects for those children.

But in States like Kentucky, West Virginia, and many others, the first priorities are often school construction and

teacher salaries. The committee's own tabulations, secured through the Office of Education, show county after county in such States having eligible children amounting to 35, 40, even 50 percent of the school-age population.

I fail to see how any program can meet the needs of the children in many of these districts unless it can be directed to the general improvement of the whole school and its regular program—including classroom construction and better salaries for teachers, if those are the most pressing problems.

The needs of these schools, with their large proportions of "educationally deprived children" to use the terms of the act, surely can not be met simply by superimposing special-purpose projects, important as they are, on a foundation fundamentally weak in facilities or staff.

I do not believe it was the intention of the Congress in enacting the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to insist that the neediest school districts in the Nation—those having one-room or old wooden buildings, the lowest paid teachers, and the largest numbers of children from poor families—use the Federal funds allocated to them by this act solely for the kind of special-purpose projects which can usefully supplement the curricula of other school systems which have already met minimum basic standards.

I say this because page 9 of the Senate committee report, discussing the use of funds under the act, states:

There may be circumstances where a whole school system is basically a low-income area and the best approach in meeting the needs of educationally deprived children would be—

And I emphasize—to upgrade the regular program.

I am deeply concerned that this intention is being ignored by the Office of Education. I hope the Senate and House committees will consult with the Office of Education respecting the proposed regulations, to determine whether they will carry out this intention as expressed in the committee report. For I think it would be unfortunate if in the neediest districts in the Nation—having the oldest, most overcrowded buildings and the most overburdened teachers—local officials were prohibited from using the assistance provided by the Congress to meet their most immediate problems first.

I urge the Commissioner of Education to write into the regulations now under consideration specific provisions for any school attendance area in which 35 percent or more of the school-age children meet the criteria established by the act. Such provisions could insure that these schools will be encouraged to use the Federal assistance, as approved by the States, for the general improvement of their facilities and regular program—at least in those places where the school building or quality of instruction does not now meet minimum standards established by the State.

It seems to me that a provision of this kind would help provide the sound and proper basis for any effort, to use the terms of the act, "of sufficient scope to give reasonable promise of substan-

tial progress" toward meeting the needs of educationally deprived children in these areas.

I hope that interested Senators, including the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Mr. MORSE, will examine this question, and consider whether the regulations formulated by the Office of Education have been directed solely to the supplemental needs of groups of "educationally deprived children" in well-established school districts, or whether they properly take into account the basic and fundamental needs of the neediest school districts having the highest population of such children.

HOUSTON SPACE MUSEUM— RESOLUTION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the phenomenal success and achievements of this Nation in pioneering in the field of space exploration is well known to all of us who have been fortunate enough to personally witness these accomplishments. However, I have concern for the future generations of Americans who will know of these feats only through historical means and will not be able to personally view the achievements of this age of pioneering in space.

For this reason I have supported and urged that a space museum be established to preserve the evidence of this marvelous age, and the citizens of Houston, Tex., share that same interest. Due to the proximity of the NASA Center to Houston, and the major part which that city has played in our space efforts, I feel that the location of a space museum in that area would be an excellent action.

To illustrate the interest which the city of Houston has in establishing such a museum, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution which the city council has passed be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THANKS AND APPRECIATION TO CONGRESSMEN ALBERT THOMAS AND BOB CASEY AND SENATORS RALPH YARBOROUGH AND JOHN TOWER FOR THEIR HELP IN ATTEMPTING TO ESTABLISH A SPACE MUSEUM IN HOUSTON AND PLEDGING SUPPORT TO THEM

Whereas the city of Houston is undisputedly the space capital of the United States; and

Whereas it would be only fitting and proper that a space museum be established in this city so that present and future generations may more fully inform themselves of the achievements of the United States of America in the field of space exploration; and

Whereas various proposals have been made as to the form such a museum might take, either as an entirely new structure or as an adjunct to the present Houston Museum of Natural Science and the Burke Baker Planetarium, which are located on 4½ acres of Hermann Park ground; and

Whereas regardless of the site eventually chosen, the establishment of such a museum is of vital concern to all the citizens of Houston; and

Whereas both of the distinguished Congressmen from the city of Houston, the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS and the Honorable BOB CASEY, and both U.S. Senators from the

August 10, 1965

19167

spectful journal, Newsweek. And I think the least that could be offered by the editors of this publication is a sincere apology to the distinguished chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, and his son, Captain Teague.

HUDSON'S FIRST NEED

(Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. DYAL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, with every day that passes, comes new support for the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway legislation.

Originally proposed to cover only a short stretch of the river from New York City to Beacon, N.Y., and from the New Jersey State line to Newburgh, N.Y., it has now been embraced by Congressmen representing areas from Albany south to New York City and the New Jersey shore.

I am pleased to report that as this legislation has found support among the legislative representatives, it has been hailed as well by the residents and newspapers in the areas that would be affected by the bill.

Most recently support has come from a great New Jersey paper, the Newark Evening News. I would like to insert the thoughtful editorial comment this paper published:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, July 27, 1965]

HUDSON'S FIRST NEED

New Jersey has more than a neighborly interest in pending Federal legislation to preserve the scenic beauties of the Hudson Valley. Although New York sometimes appears to regard itself as the sole proprietor, 25 miles or so of the Hudson's western shore are in New Jersey.

One bill, by Representative OTTINGER, of Pleasantville, would create a Hudson Highlands National Scenic Waterway, extending 1 mile inland on both sides, from the Bronx to Beacon. A supplementary measure by Representative RYAN, of Manhattan, would extend the national waterway from the Bronx south to the river's mouth.

Since the Bronx and Manhattan are opposite Bergen and Hudson Counties, both bills would affect New Jersey's interests, to an extent not yet disclosed.

Governor Rockefeller has attempted to forestall Federal action by creating a Hudson Valley Scenic and Historic Corridor, from the mouth of the river to the Adirondacks. He has appointed a commission empowered to acquire thousands of acres for parks and to build scenic roads. The Governor's case against Federal intrusion has merit; it would be stronger had he moved earlier.

The Regional Plan Association has suggested this jurisdictional dispute be resolved by the appointment of a commission to draw up a master plan for the valley. The commission would represent the Federal Government, New York, and New Jersey, their counties that border the Hudson, and the municipalities along the river.

The association would have the planning commission go beyond the recreation, conservation, and scenic concerns to which the Rockefeller corridor and the Ottinger waterway are limited. It observes that industrial development, river transportation, port facilities, and housing also require consideration. To these should be added sanitation.

A congressional subcommittee which has been holding hearings on the Ottinger bill

had a horrifying look at what man has done to despoil not only the shores but the river itself. Interior Secretary Udall last year called the Hudson an "open sewer." The Congressmen discovered what he meant as they cruised through oil slicks, dead fish, garbage, detergent foam, beer cans, and other debris, and watched raw sewage pour into its waters.

There is room for differences of opinion about how and by whom the Hudson is to be protected and its grandeur preserved, but there can be no dispute about what it needs first. To be cleaned up.

THE U.S. COMMITMENT IN VIETNAM

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. DYAL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been written about the U.S. commitment in southeast Asia, but perhaps one of the finest insights was an editorial by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., which appeared in the New York Journal American of August 1, 1965, entitled "The President's Finest Hour."

As Mr. Hearst so aptly pointed out the President's news conference statement on Vietnam was truly "a big day for L.B.J." The situation in Vietnam is a complex one and one not susceptible to easy answers. President Johnson made this clear in his report to the Nation. He asked the American people to prepare for a long struggle, but a struggle which must eventually prove that freedom and democracy are stronger than totalitarian communism.

Mr. Hearst stated that the President "leveled with the American people; he treated them, as they should be treated, as adults, his intellectual equals."

I am sure that every American approves the candor of President Johnson as well as his commitment that we will be resolute in our demands that the quest for freedom shall not be defeated.

Mr. Hearst's editorial follows:

EDITOR'S REPORT: THE PRESIDENT'S FINEST HOUR

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

Big day for L.B.J.

That just about sums up my impression of the President's policy statement at his press conference this past Wednesday as well as the way he delivered it and the way he handled the subsequent questions from reporters.

He was at his masterful best and it was—to date—his finest hour.

There was no bravado, no jingoism, in his statement nor in his demeanor. It became clear as one listened to him that the President had spent hours of soul searching in preparing his guidelines of future U.S. policy in Vietnam. His manner was serious, deliberate, and at times deeply moving. It was not surprising to read that some of those at the conference including Mrs. Johnson were close to tears when the President spoke of his personal distress in sending "our finest young men" into this nasty war.

And he leveled with the American people; he treated them, as they should be treated, as adults, his intellectual equals. For example, he had the candor to say of the situation in Vietnam that "this is really war," not trying to mask it in some evasive catch phrase.

Candor was also admirably evident when the President advised his fellow citizens to

be prepared for what could be a long war. It was present when he said the increase in our military strength in Vietnam from 75,000 to 125,000 men probably will be followed by the commitment of additional forces. It was present when he said that doubling the draft calls from 17,000 to 35,000 a month may not be sufficient; that, depending on the course of events, Reserve units may have to be summoned to duty.

The statement achieved an almost perfect balance between determination never to knuckle under to Communist aggression or the counsel of appeasers, and a willingness always to negotiate an honorable peace.

The heart of the statement lies in these words:

"These (present) steps, like our actions in the past, are carefully measured to do what must be done to bring an end to aggression and a peaceful settlement.

"We do not want an expanding struggle with consequences that no one can foresee, nor will we bluster or bully or flaunt our power.

"But we will not surrender and we will not retreat.

"Once the Communists know, as we know, that a violent solution is impossible, then a peaceful solution is inevitable.

"We are ready now, as we have always been, to move from the battlefield to the conference table.

"I have stated publicly many times, again and again, America's willingness to begin unconditional discussions with any government at any place at any time."

The President enlarged that willingness by saying the United States is prepared to listen to Hanoi's terms for ending the fighting providing Hanoi is willing to listen to ours.

He added later, in answer to a question, that even the Vietcong guerrillas "would have no difficulty in being represented and having their views presented if Hanoi for a moment decides that she wants to cease aggression."

Finally, he energetically and dramatically encouraged efforts by the United Nations to work for an honorable peace.

The President instructed Arthur J. Goldberg, who stepped down from the Supreme Court last week to become our U.N. Ambassador, to make it his first business to present a Presidential letter to U.N. Secretary General Thant. The letter asked that "all the resources, energy and immense prestige of the United Nations be employed to bring peace."

It is significant that the policy statement, and the way it was proclaimed, either drew to the President's support, or substantially modified, some influential voices in Congress that had been openly dubious before.

Representatives GERALD R. FORD of Michigan, House minority leader, and MELVIN R. LARO of Wisconsin, chairman of the Republican conference had been demanding an all-out air attack on North Vietnam instead of a buildup of ground forces.

After the President spoke they shifted position, saying they would "wait and see." Mr. Ford added that he supported the President's "firmness against Communist aggression."

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont Republican, and a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, who also had been a critic, swung over to support. He said the policy statement "won't satisfy those who have been advocating a great expansion of the war or those who say 'get out, lock, stock, and barrel.'" He continued:

"The President's middle course will find general acceptance throughout the country and probably will be more conducive to ultimate peace than a more extreme statement would have been."

I second that.

Yes, it was a big day for L.B.J.

19168

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 10, 1965

TRIBUTES TO LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN

(Mr. BOLAND (at the request of Mr. DYAL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, additional tributes have been written about the amazing legislative accomplishments of Lawrence F. O'Brien, Special Assistant to the President for Congressional Relations.

The articles were written by two experienced and respected observers of the Capitol Hill scene, Columnist Joseph Kraft and Donald R. Larrabee, Washington correspondent for many New England newspapers. Both columnists recognize the valuable contributions Larry O'Brien has made in the field of White House-congressional liaison, and the major role he has played in the enactment of the New Frontier programs of our late beloved President John F. Kennedy, and the Great Society programs of President Lyndon Johnson. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Kraft's column, which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post, and Mr. Larrabee's column, which appeared in the Saturday, August 7, Holyoke, Mass., Transcript-Telegram, included at this point with my remarks:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 9, 1965]

INSIGHT AND OUTLOOK—APPLAUSE FOR DR. O'BRIEN

(By Joseph Kraft)

Not very long ago the Congress was organized against the White House by means of a union of race prejudice and the acquisitive instinct.

Northern Republicans would unite with southern Democrats to block civil rights laws. The two would also collaborate in measures that brought money to farm constituents in the form of subsidies, and to business supporters in the form of anti-labor laws, depletion allowances, tariffs, and defense and space contracts.

In certain quarters that unholy alliance against the administration in power was celebrated as the club.

The old system is now dead, and nothing proves it better than an obscure procedural vote taken in the House last week. It involved the new 21-day rule which makes it possible to call measures on to the floor if they have been bottled up for more than 3 weeks in the Rules Committee.

The measure at stake was repeal of a provision—14(b)—of the Taft-Hartley Law which authorized States to outlaw the closed shop.

In winning that vote the big city and labor Congressmen favoring repeal were joined by 16 of the 22 Democrats who, because their prime interest is farming, sit on the Agriculture Committee. Presumably those rural Congressmen will get their own back when the labor representatives support a farm bill in the next few weeks. But the significant thing is that the old alliance has been reversed. The club has been stood on its head.

Credit for this great change is normally given to the President because of his long experience with the Congress, and because of the great majorities he swept in with him last fall. And certainly no one would deny or disparage the President's role.

But the strategist of the change, the man who planned it 5 years ago, and who has worked it out day by day ever since, is the President's special assistant for congressional relations, Lawrence O'Brien. While all the political assistants all over the country were

writing that hate was the normal state of relations between White House and Hill, O'Brien was already beginning to develop the possibilities of cooperation.

His chief innovation was to set up in the White House a small staff charged entirely with responsibility for congressional relations. The staff was organized along the lines of the various regional and interest groups in the Senate and House. It coordinated the congressional efforts of all Government agencies. It was in constant touch with the congressional leadership. "We don't even take a headcount," one of the leaders once said, "without O'Brien."

A first gain was a far more intimate working relationship between the Administration and the little-known but extremely powerful giants in the House. As a supreme example, consider the case of the 1964 tax cut and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, WILBUR MILLS.

The administration, way back in 1962, proposed the tax cut to stimulate the economy; it was afraid that tying tax reform to the bill would kill the whole measure. MILLS, for his part, wanted a tax reform bill with a little cut added to smooth the way for reform.

Very slowly, month by month, by discreet little favors (a Presidential visit to Arkansas) and almost invisible pressure (well-organized business testimony against reform) the administration nursed MILLS along to its point of view. The bill that finally emerged from his committee, and that he steered through the House was almost all cut and no reform—just what Dr. O'Brien ordered.

A second gain was that the White House was in touch not only with the congressional leadership, but also with the backbenchers. The 16 Agriculture Committee Democrats who supported 14(b), for example, were not the committee leaders. On the contrary, the six who opposed the administration on 14(b) were precisely the senior members of this committee.

O'Brien is at last getting some public recognition for his achievements. Indeed, the President and his friends are showering him with compliments. An educated guess is that Mr. Johnson would like him to stick around in the White House job.

A good hunch is that O'Brien will leave to reenter Massachusetts politics. If nothing else the time is ripe for leavetaking. A way, a permanent way, I believe, to promote cooperation between the Executive and the Congress has been worked out.

From now on the big problems will not be getting bills through the Congress. The big problem—the second phase of the Johnson administration and the true opportunity for the Republicans—will turn on the matter of applying effectively the measures that are already on the books.

[From the Transcript-Telegram, Aug. 7, 1965]

"BEST LEGISLATOR" IN THE WHITE HOUSE IS JOHNSON'S LABEL FOR LARRY O'BRIEN

(By Donald R. Larrabee)

WASHINGTON.—Who is the "best legislator" in the White House? In terms of getting an unprecedented program enacted by Congress, the answer has to be Lyndon B. Johnson. But the President himself has pinned the title on a Kennedy man from Springfield, Mass.—Larry O'Brien who has never run for office or written the draft of a bill.

O'Brien was working for ex-Congressman, ex-Governor Foster Furcolo, of Massachusetts, at about the time Lyndon Johnson was elected to the U.S. Senate in the late 1940's. He would take Furcolo's constituents on guided tours of the Capitol. Now he takes Congressmen on a different kind of tour through Johnson territory.

The President "inherited" O'Brien from John F. Kennedy who had placed his cam-

paign organizer in charge of congressional relations early in 1961. While it was difficult for many of the Kennedy people to remain on the White House staff after November 22, 1963, O'Brien and his crew seemed to be driven by a desire to get the Kennedy program enacted.

And in the 20 months since the assassination, the administration has enjoyed untold success at the Capitol, thanks to a polished professional job by O'Brien and the basic know-how of a President who has not hesitated to put the weight of his office behind his ambitious social proposals.

Johnson is said to have liked the formalized liaison office at the White House which was created by O'Brien 4 years ago. It came into being, O'Brien suggests, because President Kennedy didn't have the votes in Congress and needed a team of contact men to help sell his ideas and smooth the legislative path. It was always tough going, but the bugs were being worked out of the machinery at the time John Kennedy died.

The remarkable legislative triumphs are being written daily and the essential ingredient, in O'Brien's view, is the strength of the Chief Executive and his leadership, with its deep roots on Capitol Hill. O'Brien operates on the theory that Congress is receptive and ready to cooperate with L.B.J. because it believes the President has the people behind him. The O'Brien office has been quick to pinpoint the weak spots and Mr. Johnson has gotten on the telephone himself to prop them up.

O'Brien claims the arm-twisting stories are exaggerated and the President has engaged in no extraordinary wheeling and dealing with Congress. The standard operating procedures of the President and O'Brien's office are probably tantamount to this, though more subtle.

Basically, for the first time in history, there is a formal arrangement whereby the 40 persons who hold liaison jobs with Congress for the various Federal departments and agencies are filing weekly progress reports to the White House. These are digested and summarized for the President's night reading on Mondays.

Mr. Johnson can thus assess—at a quick glance—his standing with Congress and the status of his legislative program. Next day he meets with the leaders of the House and Senate for strategy talks and the signals are called.

There are important functions for the White House liaison office besides counting noses when a bill is about to be considered. These range from securing special tours for a Congressman's friends or constituents to making sure the Congressman is notified when a contract is being awarded in his district—notified, that is, before anyone else hears about it.

The President, of course, has asked every Congressman and his wife to the White House this year. He has made himself and his home accessible. When bills were to be signed into law, he has made a special point of inviting everyone to the ceremonies who had any reason to be there.

Last week, for instance, Members of Congress and others were flown to Independence, Mo., where 76 pens were used in the signing of the landmark medicare bill. Every Congressman on all the committees involved in the legislation received a ceremonial pen, as did many others who were influential—people like former Representative Alime Forand of Rhode Island who filed the first medicare-social security bill on his own.

A Republican Congressman who wasn't at the ceremony received a fountain pen in the mail, even though he was a late-starting cosponsor of medicare. One freshman in the House has received three pens already in his first year and he prizes every one. Small tokens can pay big dividends.

It was at the medicare signing that Mr. Johnson, when he had named all of the Con-

gressmen who had worked on the bill through the years, pointedly added, "and, of course, the White House's best legislator, Larry O'Brien." Larry isn't expected to remain in the position much longer—he promised to stay through this session of Congress—but he seems to have created one of the more permanent fixtures in a fast-moving bureaucracy.

WIRETAPPING INVESTIGATION IN MIAMI, FLA.

(Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. DYAL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was in Miami in my district appearing before the Honorable EDWARD LONG of Missouri, chairman, and the Honorable QUENTIN BURDICK of North Dakota, member of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Senate Judiciary Committee which is investigating wiretapping and the invasion of the private rights of citizens by Government agents and private parties. Since this distinguished committee of the other body had invited me to appear before it and to present my views upon the subject under inquiry I believed that the matter being investigated by the able committee was most important to the rights of the citizens of my district and Dade County, indeed of all the country and, hence, I appeared before the subcommittee and gave a statement. I include following my remarks a copy of the statement I made.

On account of such actions in my district I was not present to answer two quorum calls in the House and to vote on H.R. 9918 amending the Fire and Casualty Act and the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia. Since an important part of this bill created a fund out of which judgments obtained by parties injured in motor vehicle accidents by persons not insured I would have voted for this bill had I been present. I was paired with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN].

The statement referred to is as follows:

WIRETAPPING INVESTIGATION IN MIAMI, FLA.

(Statement of the Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, August 9, 1965)

Mr. Chairman, let me first welcome you and the members of your subcommittee to my great State of Florida, my district and the cities of Miami and Miami Beach. I have long admired the work that you, Senator LONG, and your subcommittee have been doing on behalf of the civil liberties of the American people.

The task which your subcommittee has now undertake to investigate the use of wiretapping and snooping should receive the full praise of the American people. It is apparent from hearings which you have held that you have been able to show that honest, average and garden variety Americans have been subjected to police state tactics in a country where we have long been given to believe that honest government is essential for true democracy.

Mr. Chairman, let me make one thing absolutely clear—wiretapping in Florida is a crime. It is a crime whether it is carried out

by private persons, law enforcement officers, State or Federal agencies. It is a misdemeanor on the first offense and a felony on the second offense after one conviction. A man that has been convicted for a second time faces a mandatory sentence of 15 years in the Florida State penitentiary.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know what your investigation in this great State will reveal, but if you find that one agent in the Internal Revenue Service has placed a wire tap anywhere in the State, then I say, Mr. Chairman, that the American democratic system has been severely abused. No Federal agent, no matter how special or secret, has a right to come into Florida and break our laws. These laws were set up to protect the rights of the people of Florida. If the Federal officials do not respect our laws, then what faith can we have in the American system of Government?

Already you have shown that the laws of Massachusetts and Pennsylvania have been ignored by Internal Revenue Service agents. Let no one misunderstand me, Mr. Chairman, the people of Florida and the people of Miami will not tolerate a Federal Government which has no respect for laws of their States and the individual rights of decent citizens.

I have confidence in the Internal Revenue Service of Florida and I hope that confidence has not been and will not be found unjustified. We have all read in the papers the shocking way which the Internal Revenue agents have treated taxpayers in other States. There is an agency whose sole task is to collect taxes from the American people. We must not permit this agency to turn an important job into a frightening gestapo operation under which no American can feel protected by the laws of his own State.

Mr. Chairman, for the next few minutes, let me recall the Senate hearings which I conducted 15 years ago this month. At that time I was the chairman of the U.S. Senate subcommittee which investigated wiretapping in the District of Columbia. We were concerned only with relatively simple devices—direct wiretaps, crude induction coils for listening through doors, and simple primitive eavesdropping mechanisms. We found that even these crude devices constituted a real danger to privacy and simple decency in our society. They were violating the confidence of Howard Hughes with his lawyers. They were intruding into the privacy of the personal and official telephone calls of a respected U.S. Senator, the late Josiah Bailey of North Carolina. And they were corrupting our law-enforcement officers who knew such practices were illegal and immoral.

In the conclusion of these hearings my subcommittee made certain recommendations and I would like to read the second recommendation of that committee. "Our subcommittee is impressed by the ease with which unauthorized persons, such as Lieutenant Shimon, can invade the privacy of telephone conversations. Lieutenant Shimon testified that by allowing the persons on the repair deck of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. to believe that he was a telephone repairman, he was able to get the location of the telephone box and the appropriate telephone pair number. These boxes are located, usually one for each city block, in the basements of apartments or hotels, or on telephone poles, and the like, where they may readily be reached without being observed. A pair of wires and a headset are adequate for the purpose of listening in on conversations at these terminal points. Our subcommittee recommended that the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. address itself to the technical problem of protecting the secrecy of telephone conversations; for example, the relatively simple device of placing locks on such terminal boxes would materially assist in preventing unauthorized

access to them. Unquestionably, technically qualified persons could develop additional safeguards to hamper the practice of wiretapping and more adequate methods for detecting it when it occurs."

Again, Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize, our subcommittee was impressed by the ease with which unauthorized persons, such as Lieutenant Shimon, could invade the privacy of telephone conversations. These were law-enforcement agents who took the cloak of authority and misused it for their own purposes.

In the short time that those hearings were held, my subcommittee discovered that an officer of the law who had frequently violated the rights of privacy and had been so deeply involved in wiretapping and snooping activities at the time of hearings was promoted by the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police force to captain in 1954 and inspector in 1960, but it was not until 1962 that was he indicted for wiretapping, and it is my understanding that last winter he was convicted.

I can only regret that my term in the U.S. Senate did not last long enough to pursue this further. The work of your subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, is profoundly vital and long overdue. In 1950 it seemed to us that wiretapping could be stopped by a minimum amount of restrictions, we had no idea that this insidious evil was creeping through agencies of the American Government. We had no idea that wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping would become the big business it is today. Yet those devices were nothing compared with the sophisticated electronic equipment available to the most casual of snoopers today. Tiny transmitters in cigarette lighters, desk staplers and martini olives surround us. Black-light viewers penetrate the darkness. Ultrasensitive listening devices tune in conversations a block away. These people have done nothing but to bring the world of Dick Tracy and 1984 to life and cast that horrible world against the constitutional rights of the American people.

As a result, a man's home is no longer his castle. It is a public preserve of every peeping Tom, Dick, and Harry who can afford a miniature listening device and a midget recorder. The only way a man can avoid an illegal search of his mind is to stop talking to anyone—even his wife.

Mr. Chairman and Senator BURDICK, I believe Congress should enact legislation forbidding the shipment in interstate commerce of these various electronic and other devices which lend themselves to the invasion of the citizen's privacy and against which the citizen now has no known defense—at least in the great majority of cases. The harm such devices can do in invading the right of privacy of the citizen far outweighs, in my opinion, the right of anybody to manufacture and sell these devices until science has developed a way by which the citizen can protect himself or herself against such snooping.

Furthermore, I believe that the use of such devices should be forbidden under adequate penalty except by a representative of Federal, State, or local government authorized to use such device by order of a competent court or without license for specific case by the Attorney General. All court orders should be required to be reported promptly to the Attorney General of the United States and he in turn should be required periodically to report all instances of where he has authorized the use of such devices and where he has been advised of authority to use such devices by courts to the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and House.

When a man is not free to speak his mind in the privacy of his own home he has lost one of the most treasured of his liberties—he is no longer a freeman.

19170

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 10, 1965

Mr. Chairman, let me say again how deeply grateful I am for this opportunity to appear before your subcommittee. I know I speak for the people of Miami and the people of this great State when I say you are performing an outstanding service in uncovering this disgusting disrespect that our Federal agents have shown for the rights of the American people.

In spite of my long knowledge of the existence of wiretapping, I remain shocked to find that our Federal Government has taken up the banner of lawlessness in too many cases. The American Government simply does not have the right to do what it pleases. Too many American lives have been lost in the protection of our American ways, American freedom, and American rights for us to give them up to Government lawbreakers.

I am confident you are making a great contribution and I urge you to pursue this task relentlessly until this cancer on our society is stopped.

FLORIDA-COLOMBIA PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE PROGRAM

(Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. DYAL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, recently a dramatic errand of mercy took place that happily resulted in the saving of children's lives. A number of Floridians responded to an urgent call from Children's Hospital in Barranquilla, a coastal city in Colombia, for medicines and supplies to fight an epidemic of dehydration suffered by youngsters in the area. A supply of dextrose solution was flown from Miami to the stricken city and successfully administered. The supplies arrived only hours before the hospital's stock was exhausted.

Mr. Speaker, Florida is participating in the Partners of the Alliance program, which seeks to draw private sector resources into the Alliance for Progress. Their partnership is with the northern coastal states of Colombia, wherein Barranquilla is located. Here was a dramatic instance of spontaneous help extended by one partner to the other to prevent further loss of life. A happier ending resulted because the coordinator of the Colombia Partners Committee alerted their Florida counterparts to the impending crisis. Here was a ready and helping hand extended to a neighbor in need.

Playing an important role in the mercy flight was Secretary of State Tom Adams, who helped launch the Florida-Colombia Alliance Committee. Mr. Larry Benson, who serves as administrative assistant to the secretary of state, and as coordinator of the Florida-Colombia program, made the trip to Barranquilla to personally deliver the medicines and supplies, donated for the mission by Baxter Laboratories and Johnson & Johnson. Aerocondor Airlines, a private Colombia airline, handled the shipment without charge.

Mr. Speaker, because of the very human appeal of this recent and highly successful Florida-Colombia partnership activity, there will always be a warm glow in the hearts of the people of Barranquilla, Colombia, for Miami Springs Pharmacist John Stadnik. And for good reason.

Stadnik is credited by doctors of the Hospital Infantil San Francisco de Paula with helping to save the lives of several hundred indigent children during an epidemic of gastroenteritis this summer.

Stadnik, a member of the Florida State Board of Pharmacy, is president of Miami Springs Pharmacy, Inc., and Terminal Rexal Pharmacy, Miami International Airport. He is a registered pharmacist.

His role in the humanitarian act was to arrange for the donation of medicines and supplies from two large U.S. pharmaceutical firms to fight the epidemic. Baxter Laboratories of Morton Grove, Ill., and Johnson & Johnson contributed some 30 cases of dextrose solution, intravenous feeding apparatus, hospital tape, first aid supplies and other materials for Colombia.

Dr. Ramiro Parías Burgos, director of the children's hospital, said:

Without those medicines, many Colombian infants would have died.

These supplies enabled us to successfully treat several hundred babies and young children. I hate to think about how many of these might have died had it not been for the timely arrival of the medical supplies.

More than 500 infants had perished in the epidemic in the Colombian coastal city when the mercy shipment arrived on July 20. Within a few hours after Stadnik delivered the supplies, the Children's Hospital used the last of its dextrose solution.

The doctor said:

There was no place in all of Barranquilla we could obtain more dextrose.

The shipment from Florida was truly a godsend.

Gastroenteritis, commonly known as dehydration, is a fly-carried disease which causes inflammation of the inner wall of the stomach and subsequent loss of body liquids. Its prime victims are children between the ages of 6 months and 2 years.

Stadnik's mercy flight came in response to an urgent plea for assistance from Dr. Parías. The request was relayed to Florida Secretary of State Tom Adams, who is cofounder of the Florida-Colombia Alliance Committee. The alliance is a good will and mutual assistance program between the State of Florida and Republic of Colombia.

Adams then called on Stadnik, a personal friend, for assistance in obtaining the much needed medical supplies. Stadnik, through the offices of Dr. Austin Smith, president of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, contacted Baxter Laboratories and Johnson & Johnson who quickly offered to donate the necessary supplies to the alliance.

Aerocondor Air Lines, a private Colombian airline, volunteered to immediately airlift the supplies to Barranquilla without charge and to fly Stadnik to Colombia so that he might formally present the medicines to the hospital. Also accompanying the shipment was Laurence Benson, Coordinator of the Florida-Colombia program.

Said Adams:

This is a wonderful and heartwarming example of what great things can be accomplished when people work together un-

selfishly. On behalf of the Florida-Colombia Alliance effort, I want to express my deep appreciation to all those who had a part in this mission of mercy, and particularly to John Stadnik, Aerocondor Air Lines, Baxter Laboratories, and Johnson & Johnson.

The Florida-Colombia Alliance program was established in October 1963, following a weeklong good will visit by Adams to Colombia. The trip was sponsored by the Organization of American States in hopes of generating a "State to Nation" program between the individual States of the United States and the republics of Latin America.

The Florida-Colombia Alliance Committee is a partner in the U.S. Alliance for Progress and engages in such cooperative efforts as student and teacher exchanges, encouragement of commerce and exchanges of technical advice and training. To date, the alliance has arranged for 90 scholarships for Colombian students to attend universities and junior colleges in Florida. A like number of scholarships are available to Floridians in Colombian universities.

THE MIRACULOUS RISE OF NICHOLAS KATZENBACH

(Mr. PUCINSKI (at the request of Mr. DYAL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Willard Edwards has performed a most noble public service in putting together an excellent biography on the U.S. Attorney General, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach.

Mr. Katzenbach today ranks as one of the most important members of the President's Cabinet. As Attorney General, the responsibility of enforcing civil rights laws and restoring order out of chaos falls upon his shoulders. The vast scope of his responsibility transcends to the lives of virtually every American.

In addition to all of these responsibilities, President Johnson has recently named Mr. Katzenbach as Chairman of the newly formed National Commission on Crime. It is significant to note that everything Mr. Katzenbach does, he does well.

I was most pleased to read Mr. Edwards' penetrating article about our U.S. Attorney General. Mr. Edwards has made a most significant contribution toward a better understanding of this dedicated American whose stature and responsibility grows daily and who today represents one of the President's most trusted aids.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edwards' article follows:

THE MIRACULOUS RISE OF NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH

(NOTE.—Attorneys General are usually men of long and successful political experience. Many managed the campaigns that put their Presidents in power. In 1960 Nicholas deB. Katzenbach didn't even vote. Yet today he runs the most politically sensitive department in Washington with the courage, coolness, brains, and savvy that have made him a key figure in the administrations of two hard-to-please Presidents.)

August 10, 1965

Support for President in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, there is in this country a great reservoir of support for the President regarding the situation we face in Vietnam. I commend to the attention of my colleagues editorials which appeared recently in the Omaha World-Herald and the Lincoln Star on this subject. No greater support can be forthcoming.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, July 24, 1965]

MR. JOHNSON'S REPORT

If President Johnson's Wednesday morning address to the Nation had not been preceded by thunderous advance publicity and a prediction about a callup of Reserves, his words might have had more impact than they did.

Even so, the President committed his countrymen to a substantial mobilization of America's military might to fight what he indicated most plainly will be a long, hard, and probably bigger war in Vietnam.

The number of American fighting men there is to be stepped up from 75,000 to 125,000. These are men now on active duty, not Reserves, and many of them have doubtless been expecting to be called.

But the increase in the monthly draft is to be more than doubled—from 17,000 to 35,000—and here the impact upon tens of thousands of young men and their families very likely may not have been anticipated by them.

Finally, there was the President's solemn comment about the likelihood of more men being called up later.

The number was unspecified but it will be whatever the American commander, General Westmoreland, says he needs. The President's repeated pledge to stand fast, to refuse to retreat or to surrender, has lost nothing in its plain wording or its emphasis in these recent months of hard going in Vietnam.

Aside from the increase in forces, there was little that was news in the President's speech. As he pointed out, he has said over and over again that America will stand and fight in Vietnam, that the United States cannot go back on its word, that our country has to face up to Communist aggression in Vietnam or its promises to defend free men elsewhere will not be believed anywhere.

What was perhaps most important about the speech was its demonstration that Mr. Johnson has not flagged in his determination. Neither the ear nor the eye could detect the slightest evidence of sagging resolution.

And the clinching proof that Mr. Johnson meant what he said was the reluctant commitment of more American lives to the brutal battle.

We believe that Mr. Johnson has so far done about all that can reasonably be demanded of him in informing the people about the progress—or more properly, the lack of progress—of the dismal Asian war. This newspaper feels that the President has acted with prudent firmness in trying to impress upon the enemy the all-important fact that the United States has no intention of losing this war.

Mr. Johnson has now followed through with the commitment of more men and military power. He has asked his countrymen to support him through what are sure to be

more dark days. He deserves and will almost surely get that support.

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star, July 29, 1965]

A TIME OF COURAGE

President Johnson gave the world little relief from the troubles that beset it in his analysis of the Vietnam situation but the American people can find pride in the position he took. The President made no bones about the fact that we are at war in Asia and he announced the sending of 50,000 more troops to that torn land.

At the same time, he felt considerably short of full mobilization of the Nation and gave equal emphasis to the cause of peace for which we are fighting. Toward this end he has instructed the U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. to press that world organization for a greater effort in solving the Vietnam conflict.

Many are the details of the situation that can be debated but our fundamental course of action seems unquestionable. Rightly or wrongly in the beginning, we have committed ourselves to the defense of the freedom of the people of South Vietnam and we can no more walk out on that commitment than we can withdraw from the world itself.

The President has made clear to the world a course of action on our part that is honorable in all respects. We seek peace within the framework of freedom for all men but we recognize that such a goal must be fought for when challenged by an aggressive force.

Escalation of the war is a threat we face but we do so without flinching. Red China and Russia hold the real key to the future. Either they forgo the tyranny by which they live or they thrust a terrible burden and great suffering upon humanity. The President has made it clear to them that they will not prevail through default of the free world.

Sergeants' Stripes Saved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, in June of this year it was brought to my attention that many enlisted members of the Army were about to be downgraded because of action by the Department of the Army which would have stripped certain noncommissioned officers of their earned stripes.

The stripe is a symbol of achievement and authority just as the uniform is a symbol of military service for all service personnel.

The noncommissioned officers who were to have their stripes taken away by administrative action had done nothing to deserve this humiliation. As a former Army sergeant I understood how today's sergeants felt about this and I was deeply concerned about this proposal, which would have gone into effect on September 1, 1965.

On June 15, 1965, I introduced H.R. 9046, a bill to specify the insignia of grade for certain enlisted members of the Army. This legislation was referred to my committee, the House Armed Services Committee, for action. In the

meantime, I wrote to the Secretary of the Army, and urged him to make an adjustment, to spare the humiliation for thousands of our noncommissioned officers. Today I am pleased to report to the men and to the Association of Regular Army Sergeants, who fought this battle with me, that the Department of the Army has sympathetically decided upon the indefinite suspension of the directive which led to this situation. I am very grateful. With permission I include the Secretary of the Army's statement in the RECORD:

ENLISTED STRIPE REVISION

The Department of the Army decided today upon the indefinite suspension of the directive which would have required a chevron change for many noncommissioned officers on September 1, 1965. In the spring of this year, the Army initiated a review of selected noncommissioned officer positions and the relationship between these positions. It has now become evident that a more searching analysis is required in order to establish definitively the proper proportion of noncommissioned officer grades in the organizations that the Army has created as a result of conversion to the reorganized Infantry division 3 years ago and the conversion to a new combat logistics structure this year. Since insignia is an identification of an individual's position, the Army has decided that the finite examination of positions is required prior to the time that further insignia changes are made.

The Goal Is Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Roscoe Drummond, from the July 30, 1965, edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

The action taken by President Johnson to increase U.S. military strength in Vietnam is the inescapable result of the decision made by the President more than 3 months ago. This decision was enunciated in the President's April 7 address at Johns Hopkins University, "We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw." The President has declared his determination to do "whatever is necessary" to oppose Communist aggression in Vietnam, while making efforts to secure an honorable peace. The American people must apply the costly lesson of Munich and Korea to Vietnam—when aggression is not resisted it invites worse aggression. The President is applying this lesson in his firm action in Vietnam to avert worse war and to find a safe peace.

The article follows:

THE GOAL IS PEACE—JOHNSON FOLLOWS UP
EARLY VIETNAM DECISION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The actions President Johnson is taking to build up U.S. strength in the defense of South Vietnam are inescapable.

August 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4437

in his report of one general meeting of the foreign AFS students during their Washington bus stop.

He also recorded some candid observations of these bright, knowledgeable, observant youngsters which should be worthwhile for all native U.S. citizens to read and ponder:

EXCHANGE STUDENTRY
(By Robert Cahn)

WASHINGTON.—Abraham Minawa is taking home to Uganda a "Big M" sweater from Murray High School, St. Paul, Minn., as well as a new appreciation of how the United States is trying to solve its racial problems.

Protima Nag will tell her young friends in Calcutta that Americans work hard and play hard, that the moral standards are really high despite what they may have read about Hollywood.

Pedro Misle hopes to spread some of the ideas he has gained about how a democracy works when he returns to Caracas.

And Dagmar Schranum is taking back to Austria, among other things, some American cookbooks.

Abraham, Protima, Pedro, and Dagmar are 4 of the 2,904 American Field Service international scholarship students from 59 foreign countries who have just completed a year in the United States.

In communities throughout the Nation, they and their colleagues have been "adopted" for the year by American families with teenage children.

PRESIDENT HEARD

They have gone to American high schools. They have taken a 3-week bus trip through part of the United States. And they have climaxed the year with a get-together in Washington which included an address at the White House by President Johnson.

Many of the youngsters have had such a good time that they would like to stay longer. But their parents signed agreements that the students would come home on time and not return to the United States for at least 2 years.

The whole purpose of the AFS scholarships is to promote better international understanding. And it is hoped that these youths—and the 1,100 Americans who have been spending a year or a summer in foreign countries under AFS scholarships—will become good will ambassadors among their compatriots.

SPORTS ENJOYED

With a bright smile flashing across his dark face, Abraham Minawa relates how he won fourth place in the State championship at Murray High when he pole-vaulted 12 feet 6 inches.

"Yeah, Murray," he shouts, while bantering with other AFS students here. Abraham has a lot to tell the homefolks about American sports and American life.

But he also knows of the problems.

"My 'father,'" he says (most AFS'ers refer to their American parents-for-a-year as if they were their own), "took me to Nashville so I could see for myself about the race situation."

Abraham was refused service in one Nashville restaurant. But he also knows he was accepted as an equal at Murray High. And he lived as a member of a white family.

He says that in Uganda, all he heard about the United States was that Negroes were being beaten.

"Now that I have been here, I realize the race problem is something that can't be solved in a few days," he says. "But Americans are making a good start."

VIEWS EXCHANGED

During their days in Washington, the students had opportunities to evaluate opin-

ions of the United States and to exchange views with those who spent the year in other parts of the country.

They heard presidential assistant Richard N. Goodwin explain the Great Society program and say to the students from developing nations: "You must insure that in your own revolutions there is widening room for the human heart and the human spirit."

On the south lawn of the White House, they heard President Johnson thank them for leaving behind a better understanding of their countries.

"While you have been here I am sure you have seen things that you don't like, things that you would like to change," Mr. Johnson said. "If you have, then you can know that you have seen America as Americans themselves see it."

"FUNDS COLLECTED

"We have been concerned more with how our children shall live than with emulating how our fathers and how our grandfathers lived. So this spirit of America, I think, is present in our policies and our purposes toward other peoples of other lands."

"We hope that wherever you go you will work always, as we work, to try to change, to try to improve the life of mankind on this earth, and most of all, to try to win peace for all peoples," the President said.

The American Field Service, which was widely lauded for supplying ambulance drivers during World War I, started its scholarship program in 1947. A total of 19,075 students have come to the United States under the program.

Local chapters of AFS in each community raise funds to sponsor a student and arrange a home for him. The foreign student's own family is expected, if possible, to pay the transportation to and from the United States.

The United States State Department, through Public Law 480 funds, picks up some of the transportation costs.

If the American family or local AFS chapter cannot provide spending money, the scholarship program gives each student \$14 a month. The end-of-the-year bus trip is paid for by the scholarship program.

"I like the informal atmosphere of your schools. I like your food very much and your dances. The dances are getting a lot like our dances, but they have different names. * * * I enjoyed hearing your Attorney General speak to us. I think he just spoke for my benefit." Barbara Thornton, Bridgetown, Barbados (spent year in Horry, Wis.).

"I used to think that everyone in America had low moral standards. * * * But I found the moral standards very high. I also learned a lot from American youth. They don't just spend all their time having fun." Protima Nag, Calcutta, India (spent year in Jacksonville, Ill.).

"I learned a lot about democracy in my year here, and I hope I can spread it in my country. * * * In one way, President Johnson was wrong when he talked about our coming to 'America.' I have lived in America for 17 years. We are as much America as you are." Pedro Misle, Caracas, Venezuela (spent year in Girard, Ohio).

"I can only hope that other countries treat their foreign visitors as well as you do in America. * * * I like your school system where all the students, bright and average and not so bright, are put together. In Germany, we have separate schools for those of different abilities." Ingrid Zuendorf, Hamburg, Germany (spent year in Rantoul, Ill.).

"From what I had seen on television and read about America, I had a vague idea that it would be a strange country to me. But I

found that Americans behave and react much the same as my own people." Lina Jacinto, Cavite, Philippine Islands (spent year in Washougal, Wash.).

"I like your school system here better than our system of French schools. Your system builds independence and gets into subjects very deeply. * * * Your Negro problem should be settled more quickly. A great nation shouldn't have a problem like this." Ibrahim Merturk, Istanbul, Turkey (spent year in Santa Ana, Calif.).

"I carry back home two impressions: good and bad. Your people are really friendly and really nice. But some of your teenagers are not very polite. * * * Also some teenagers drive too fast and act a little crazy. But most of them were real fine." Phay Darapheth, Arroyo, Laos (spent year in Merced, Calif.).

"I found out that Americans are really behind my country. * * * This year meant a lot to me; I felt I really grew up. And I found that my earlier impressions about America were wrong. Americans are not naturally rich. They have to work hard for their money." Thuy Van Nguyen, Saigon, Vietnam (spent year in Clinton, Iowa).

"I learned from Americans to be more openminded and to make friends easier. I also liked it that your country does not try to cover up its problems. * * * I didn't get any credit for my schooling here because I took only five subjects. In Sweden I regularly take 13 subjects." Kersten Nordstrom, Sweden (spent year in Minneapolis).

"In Uganda, about all we would hear of the United States was that Negroes were being beaten. I didn't hear about any of the steps being taken in the civil rights movement. Now that I have been here, I realize the race problems can't be solved in a few days." Abraham Minawa, Kampala, Uganda (spent year in St. Paul, Minn.).

"I found it a lot easier in America not to be prejudiced on the race situation. I am for civil rights. I had to work it out in my own way, and now I find myself able to treat anybody as an equal." Rob Jackson, Johannesburg, South Africa (spent year in Pontiac, Mich.).

"If everybody here could have learned as much as I have about human relationships and the ability to understand people, it would help lead to world peace. This experience in the United States has expanded the world of all of us." Cheryl Thomas, Salisbury, Rhodesia (spent year in Tonawanda, N.Y.).

"This year helped me see there is little difference between peoples of various countries except their customs. * * * I don't see why there is so much trouble between whites and Negroes in the South. * * * Negroes were treated equally at my school." Seiji Furuta, Gifu, Japan (spent year in West Philadelphia).

"When I came I had a completely different concept of the United States. I thought that everybody was rich and the teenagers just had fun. But I learned that North Americans have the same problems that we have." Miriam Levano, Lima, Peru (spent year in Hibbing, Minn.).

The story requires one slight correction: AFS is a volunteer program, privately financed without governmental direction, sponsoring, or financial aid. This is one reason for its tremendous growth and strength. AFS does, however, greatly appreciate the splendid cooperation and accommodations it receives from the many governments within which AFS operates, including the U.S. Department of State and President Johnson.

August 10, 1965

A4439

They are wise actions because their goal is peace, not war.

The President had no hard decision to make this week. He had already made the hard decision more than 3 months ago. Everything we are now doing in Vietnam flows from it.

The really hard, soul-searching, somewhat-may decision was made by Mr. Johnson on the eve of his April 7 address at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. It was embodied and embedded in these three in- candescent sentences:

"We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw"—until peace is assured.

No further decision on policy or will or commitment had to be made. All that remained was to determine the means to implement that decision—larger U.S. forces in Vietnam, larger draft calls, larger defense budget, and—in the end—"whatever is necessary."

Mr. Johnson rightly says that three Presidents have given their word that the United States would help. But there is a difference. It is not putting it too bluntly to say the difference is this:

President Eisenhower decided to aid South Vietnam.

President Kennedy decided to continue aiding South Vietnam.

President Johnson decided to succeed in aiding South Vietnam.

Because President Johnson is committed to successfully defending South Vietnam against the Communist use of force to take over the country, he has decreed "whatever is necessary" to do it will be employed.

This is not a decision taken by the President alone. It is shared by Congress which earlier approved the President's course. And will have to approve again when more defense appropriations are sought.

Mr. Johnson well knows there are mis- givings and doubts and puzzlement about why we are fighting in Vietnam. There couldn't possibly be a harder decision for a President to make than to send American soldiers into combat when the nation itself has not been directly attacked.

When World War I and World War II came to the shores of the United States— through the German U-boats and at Pearl Harbor—no painful decision of whether or not to resist had to be made. It was auto- matic and self-evident.

Today the President is asking the Ameri- can people to ponder carefully the lessons of Munich and of Korea. The world invited Hitler's terrible aggression by trying to buy him off through appeasement. It didn't work. It led to more aggression.

Before the Communist attack on South Korea, we had withdrawn most of our forces and left the door open to another aggres- sion. It came and, too late to avert it, Presi- dent Truman bravely decided it had to be resisted.

Today the United States is helping defend South Vietnam because we are applying the grimmest, the most costly and the most crucial lesson of war to date. It is that, if aggression is not resisted—and resisted successfully—when it begins, it will grow and spread and the end result of failing to resist will be worse aggression, worse war, under worse conditions.

To withdraw in the face of the aggression against South Vietnam would mean only that we would have to prepare for the next aggression—and the next.

This is the lesson of Munich. This is the lesson of World War II. This is the lesson of Korea.

President Johnson is applying this lesson to save lives, to avert worse war, and to find the way to a safer peace.

Applause for O'Brien

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1965

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point an article from the Washington Post by Joseph Kraft entitled "Applause for Dr. O'Brien." This article recognizes the outstanding achievement of my good friend, the President's Special Assistant for Congressional Relations, Lawrence O'Brien, in helping to gain congressional acceptance for the programs of the Great Society. Mr. Speaker, Larry O'Brien is one individual who deserves a great deal of credit for the outstanding legislative victories of President Johnson's pro- grams.

The article follows:

APPLAUSE FOR DR. O'BRIEN

(By Joseph Kraft)

Not very long ago the Congress was or- ganized against the White House by means of a union of race prejudice and the acquisi- tive instinct.

Northern Republicans would unite with Southern Democrats to block civil rights laws. The two would also collaborate in measures that brought money to farm constituents in the form of subsidies, and to business sup- porters in the form of antilabor laws, depen- dent allowances, tariffs, and defense and space contracts.

In certain quarters that unholy alliance against the administration in power was celebrated as the club.

The old system is now dead, and nothing proves it better than an obscure procedural vote taken in the House last week. It in- volved the new 21-day rule which makes it possible to call measures on to the floor if they have been bottled up for more than 3 weeks in the Rules Committee.

The measure at stake was repeal of a pro- vision—14(b)—of the Taft-Hartley law which authorized States to outlaw the closed shop.

In winning that vote the big city and labor Congressmen favoring repeal were joined by 16 of the 22 Democrats who, because their prime interest is farming, sit on the Agri- culture Committee. Presumably those rural Congressmen will get their own back when the labor Representatives support a farm bill in the next few weeks. But the significant thing is that the old alliance has been re- versed. The club has been stood on its head.

Credit for this great change is normally given to the President because of his long ex- perience with the Congress, and because of the great majorities he swept in with him last fall. And certainly no one would deny or disparage the President's role.

But the strategist of the change, the man who planned it 5 years ago, and who has worked it out day by day ever since, is the President's Special Assistant for Congres- sional Relations, Lawrence O'Brien. While all the political assistants all over the coun- try were writing that hate was the normal state of relations between White House and Hill, O'Brien was already beginning to de- velop the possibilities of cooperation.

His chief innovation was to set up in the White House a small staff charged entirely with responsibility for congressional rela- tions. The staff was organized along the lines of the various regional and interest

groups in the Senate and House. It coordi- nated the congressional efforts of all Govern- ment agencies. It was in constant touch with the congressional leadership. "We don't even take a head count," one of the leaders once said, "without O'Brien."

A first gain was a far more intimate work- ing relationship between the administration and the little known but extremely powerful giants in the House. As a supreme example, consider the case of the 1964 tax cut and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, WILBUR MILLS.

The administration, way back in 1962, pro- posed the tax cut to stimulate the economy; it was afraid that tying tax reform to the bill would kill the whole measure. MILLS, for his part, wanted a tax reform bill with a little cut added to smooth the way for reform.

Very slowly, month by month, by discreet little favors (a Presidential visit to Arkansas) and almost invisible pressures (well-orga- nized business testimony against reform) the administration nursed MILLS along to its point of view. The bill that finally emerged from his committee, and that he steered through the House was almost all cut and no reform—just what Dr. O'Brien ordered.

A second gain was that the White House was in touch not only with the congressional leadership, but also with the back benchers. The 16 Agriculture Committee Democrats who supported 14(b), for example, were not the committee leaders. On the contrary, the six who opposed the administration on 14(b) were precisely the senior members of the committee.

O'Brien is at last getting some public rec- ognition for his achievement. Indeed, the President and his friends are showering him with compliments. An educated guess is that Mr. Johnson would like him to stick around in the White House job.

A good hunch is that O'Brien will leave to reenter Massachusetts politics. If nothing else the time is ripe for leavetaking. A way, a permanent way I believe, to promote co- operation between the Executive and the Congress has been worked out.

From now on the big problems will not be getting bills through the Congress. The big problem—the second phase of the Johnson administration and the true opportunity for the Republicans—will turn on the matter of applying effectively the measures that are already on the books.

The World Population Explosion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, debate and positive action on the subject of the popu- lation explosion has come a long way in the last 10 years. Many of our States presently have laws setting up birth- control programs for those in need. Discussion in my own State of Michi- gan has perhaps proceeded farther than in many other States because of the rationality and concern of lawmakers, public-spirited citizens, voluntary orga- nizations, and members of the press. I might stress that concern on this issue is fully bipartisan.

A4440

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 10, 1965

An outstanding example of the concern that this issue has raised in my own State is to be seen in an editorial published yesterday by the Detroit Free Press. As the editorial points out:

Birth control, a subject once thought unspeakable, suddenly is being talked about.

The Free Press could not have been more to the point.

The editorial follows:

DUAL PROBLEMS OF MAN: WAR AND THE BIRTH RATE

Birth control, a subject once thought unspeakable, suddenly is being talked about. President Johnson spoke about it at the U.N. There was scarcely a ripple of protest.

A decade ago, President Eisenhower, fearing a bitter national debate, said birth control was "not a business of Government." Now he points to the futility of foreign aid programs where population outdistances progress.

Testimony that would have frightened the most intrepid lawmaker was recently given at a hearing conducted by Senator ERNEST GRUENING.

The reasons for this change are as difficult to judge as the public thoughts on any controversial subject. It may be a sudden maturity or it may be, as we suspect, that earlier fears were magnified.

Witnesses on Gruening's bill, a measure to establish offices of population problems in the Department of State and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, show the need for such a national debate.

The international danger was voiced by Dr. George B. Kistiakowski, former special assistant to President Eisenhower for science and technology.

"Two great problems face all of us: prevention of war and prevention of a world population explosion," Kistiakowski said. "They are not completely unrelated."

The domestic problem was described by John Martin, of Grand Rapids, a spokesman for the Planned Parenthood Association of Kent County.

"The indiscriminate production of unwanted and rejected children has resulted in a large measure of our delinquency and crime," Martin said.

Any program should include unwed mothers or it would ignore the most pathetic cases. It would also leave out a growing percentage of mothers. In 1950 the ratio of illegitimate to legitimate births in Michigan was 2.76 percent. It has risen each year until now it is 5.56 percent. Some deprived areas now have a 22-percent illegitimacy rate.

The success of planned parenthood programs was shown by a pilot project in Mecklenburg County, N.C., Martin said. The public welfare department enrolled 732 clients in the program in 1960, including many unwed mothers. Today 75 percent of these women are still in the program and none of them has become pregnant. Previously, these women had had 3,440 pregnancies.

The most pathetic evidence was a Michigan Health Department study of maternal deaths. It showed that 77 women died in the State from 1960 to 1964 as a result of "criminal or self-induced abortions."

These deaths were most apt to occur with women "who are 20 to 34 years of age, married, and who have one to six children." It concluded: "These women resort to criminal or self-induced abortion as a means of limiting family size."

This and other evidence are the ingredients of a debate called for by Catholic as well as Protestant spokesmen.

Answers will be difficult. But before we started talking about the problem, they were impossible.

The Space Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to make available to the Members of Congress and those who are interested in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech entitled "The Space Challenge," delivered by Dr. Edward C. Welsh, executive secretary, National Aeronautics and Space Council, on the occasion of the 10th Symposium on Space and Ballistic Missile Technology, held in San Diego, Calif., commencing August 4.

As usual, Dr. Welsh has done a magnificent job in defining our space efforts. His address follows:

THE SPACE CHALLENGE

(Keynote address by Dr. Edward C. Welsh, executive secretary, National Aeronautics and Space Council, San Diego, Calif., Aug. 4, 1965)

It is an honor and a pleasure to participate in the opening session of this 10th Symposium on Space and Ballistic Missile Technology. I appreciate the opportunity afforded me.

Before making a few remarks regarding our national space program, I want to convey the Vice President's regrets at his being unable to be present and to express his sincere wishes for a successful symposium. He asked that I encourage this distinguished audience "to step up the Nation's technological progress, as peace and freedom rely heavily upon our technological leadership."

MISUNDERSTANDING

There exists a serious misunderstanding about our space program. All too many people seem to have the impression that part of our program is peaceful in intent and nature while the other part is something different, presumably nonpeaceful. This misconception goes further by attempting to identify the nonpeaceful and the non-scientific with the military and to credit the peaceful and the scientific to the civilian. This distinction could not be more wrong.

There are those, however, in the Government as well as outside the Government who foster this type of confusion. Such inaccuracy of expression and of thinking causes unwarranted friction between Government agencies, unnecessary suspicion of our intentions on the part of other nations, and serious difficulties for those who attempt to explain our space planning to the Congress and to the public.

PEACEFUL PURPOSE

The fact is—in both policy and practice—that all of our space activities are peaceful. Moreover, no arm of the Government has a monopoly over our peaceful space projects. Just in case it may have been forgotten, let me quote from our highest policy level. In 1962, President Johnson, then Vice President and the Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, stated: "The United States does not have a division between peaceful and nonpeaceful objectives for space but rather has space missions to help keep the peace and space missions to improve our ability to live well in peace."

In 1964, as President, he said: "Our space program, in both its civil and military aspects, is peaceful in purpose and practice."

If it were not for the currency of misconceptions, it would seem to be unnecessary to recall that the National Aeronautics and

Space Act of 1958 states: "It is the policy of the United States that activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind." In so stating, the act referred to all space activities, including those of the Defense Department as well as those of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Surely, everyone should be able to agree that there is no activity more peaceful than that which discourages aggression and thereby encourages peace.

Those who drive wedges of adverse intent between the space activities of the Defense Department and NASA, for example, do a disservice to the national effort and act to contravene national policy.

Perhaps I am belaboring the obvious. Perhaps I am emphasizing a principle concerning which you have sensed no misunderstanding. If the latter is the case, I will have to say that you are indeed in the minority. A very large number of writers and speakers—expert or not on the subject of space—attempt to make a distinction between the peaceful and military phases of our space program. Such contrasts distort the truth.

COMPLACENCY

I hasten to add, however, that I am not saying that space cannot be used for purposes of aggression. Of course it can. No arena within the reach of man is free from the possibility of being exploited by an aggressor. Moreover, no nation should bury itself in the sands of complacency and thereby neglect to develop the technological and military strength so necessary for deterring potential aggressors.

The maintenance of such strength in no respect conflicts with the policy of peace. In fact, the more competent we are to prevent surprise, to discover aggressive maneuvers, and to intercept hostile weapons in any medium, the better chance we have of living in peace. That is why I have taken such a keen interest in our military space developments.

When I state, therefore, that our entire national space program is peaceful, I mean that we have no aggressive intent, that we seek no domination over other peoples, and that we are eager to share the benefits of space exploration with all mankind. I do not mean, however, that we intend to be naive, complacent, or weak.

COOPERATION

Cooperation between the Defense Department and NASA takes continued effort and attention. It is not enough to legislate that cooperation. Rather, it is something which has to be worked on at all times—and that is being done. As I pointed out previously, those who drive wedges—like claiming that one agency is peaceful and the other is not, or that one agency's activities are essential while the others are not—tend to undermine what is generally a condition of healthy competition and constructive cooperation.

I also believe in international space cooperation whenever such joint endeavor will improve technology, increase our store of knowledge, or further the pursuit of peace. This means that international space cooperation, in order to be justifiable, must be mutual in its benefits and must not in any case diminish the relative strength of this country.

GROWTH

As much, however, as I favor international cooperation in space—and I do so emphatically—cooperation within our country is even more important. If one looks backward to the beginning of the development of ballistic missile technology and follows that record of growth through to the present time, he will see step-by-step progress. Sometimes the steps were hesitant or slow ones and sometimes very rapid. But whether slow or fast, the net result was a vastly in-

A4444

Sponsored by Senators HOLLAND and SMATHERS, the lobby's bill consists of two provisions, both embodied in single sentences of inordinate length. First, the bill states that a utility which is not "directly connected" with an interstate power network is to be exempt from the regulations of the FPC "as a matter of local concern." A second provision repeals the FPC's jurisdiction over wholesale transactions, sales of electrical power from one utility to another when the utility making the sale has substantial retail revenues in the State in which the sale is made.

If there is any logical or functional justification for the provisions of the Holland-Smathers bill, it is elusive. Under the first provision, a giant utility which generates power and sells it in its home State would be exempted from FPC regulation even though that power is resold to utility companies in a dozen other States. To treat such transactions as matters of local concern is an absurdity that can only undermine the public welfare. The second provision cuts into the Federal protection afforded small customers in wholesale power transactions, the small private utilities, and municipal cooperatives which cannot stand on an equal footing in bargaining with the large sellers that participate in the great interstate power grids.

As a strategic ploy, the supporters of the Holland-Smathers measure are threatening to attach it as a rider to a bill (S. 1495) that would exempt Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives from regulation by the FPC. The latter bill is neither necessary nor especially wise, but its fate is of small consequence. What is important is that every effort be made to defeat the Holland-Smathers bill. Its passage would utterly destroy the Federal regulation of electrical rates and revive an era of abuse that was ended with the passage of the Wheeler-Rayburn Act in 1935.

Tourists Praise National Park System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 10, 1965

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, as we are all aware, our Government is currently engaged in a most notable program to encourage greater travel within the United States in order to intensify the awareness of the beauty and great historical significance which is our rich heritage. In this spirit, I wish to call attention to the outstanding contribution to this program being made by the National Park Service.

This week I received a letter from residents of my district describing a recent trip in which they visited several national parks and monuments. I am pleased that they took this opportunity to very graciously commend employees of the National Park Service for the courteous and knowledgeable manner in which they perform their duties.

The effective work of the National Park Service is just one example of the capable and imaginative leadership which Secretary Stewart L. Udall has brought to the Department of Interior and to its programs to preserve and utilize the great natural beauty of our Nation. Unfortu-

nately, I feel that all too often the dedicated efforts of the Department and its employees have gone unheralded.

I am pleased to add my personal note of appreciation and commendation to the grateful and thoughtful comments of my constituents. At this time, I place the letter from Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Hyde, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, in the RECORD:

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA,
August 6, 1965.

HON. JOHN C. CULVER,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CULVER: Recently we and our family returned from our vacation along the eastern coast of the United States where we visited many historical monuments.

We were most impressed by those that are designated national historical monuments and are under the guidance and care of the National Park Service. The men who are on duty at these monuments are most courteous and very knowledgeable about the history of the monuments they serve.

We were extremely impressed with those we visited at Lexington and Concord, Constitution Hall in Philadelphia, and everywhere we went in Washington, D.C.

We just thought we would take this opportunity to pass on to you our deep appreciation of the fine service rendered by our Government.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. THOMAS HYDE.

Minimum Wage on Farms Boon and Bane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend any Member of this body who has it in his heart to raise the income and the living standards of farmers and of farm labor. But today I am concerned that in seeking to improve the pay of farmworkers we may eliminate many thousands of farm jobs completely—that in helping some people we may hurt many people.

I speak now to H.R. 10275 by Mr. ROOSEVELT, of California, recently approved by the General Labor Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, which proposed a minimum wage for farmworkers.

The conflicting thrusts of this legislation are analyzed, evaluated, and forcefully presented by an eminent newspaper in my own congressional district, the Raleigh, N.C., News & Observer, under an editorial heading, "Boon and Bane." The News & Observer is published by one of the Nation's most distinguished newspaper families. The late Josephus Daniels, editor and publisher from 1894 to 1948, was Secretary of the Navy under President Woodrow Wilson during World War I. His assistant then was Franklin D. Roosevelt, later to become President of the United States and to lead the Nation out of the great depression and to victory in World War II. The News & Observer now is published by the distinguished sons of Josephus Daniels.

Mr. Speaker, I think that every Mem-

ber of the House interested in the well-being of farm people should have the opportunity to read the editorial in this great newspaper, before any further action is taken on H.R. 10275. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I am publishing this in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From the Raleigh (N.C.) News & Observer,
Aug. 6, 1965]

BOON AND BANE

A bill to place farmworkers under the minimum wage holds out hope for the economic improvement of those on the bottom of the ladder. Yet, it may also forecast their elimination from any jobs at all.

The truth is that even though there are an estimated 700,000 farmworkers now who would come under the bill—about 40 percent of the total farm employment—machines may cut that number in half by the time the bill would go into full effect.

Farmers have found that with machines they can get more done at far less cost than when human hands did most of the work. Automation and the accompanying loss of jobs for people came first in many ways to the farms. One need only drive through the countryside of North Carolina to see what has happened. The empty houses are mute testimonials to the efficiency of the machines. Where fields were once filled with farmhands a lone man rides a tractor.

More money for farmworkers is reasonable and long overdue, but the fact is that any wage increase will without much doubt hasten their ouster from jobs because of machines. The farmer cannot be blamed for seeking cheaper ways to raise his crops. But there is a tragic waste nevertheless in those who will be pushed from farm jobs into places where they are unskilled and unwanted.

The retraining of farmworkers has been receiving some attention under the President's war on poverty program. Of necessity, this retraining must be stepped up and made more effective.

The blessing of a possible better wage for the farmhand is not unmixed. The boon of maybe a better living can instead be a bane of no farm work at all.

For the Lipscomb
Economy Set for Vietnam War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 9, 1965

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times, in an August 3, 1965, editorial, analyzed the impact of the decisions to increase our commitment in Vietnam on our overall economic situation.

The editorial correctly warns that the "present estimates of the war costs, and of future tax collections, may prove overly optimistic." If this were to happen, some adjustments would be needed within the competing demands of our economy. A proper question is raised as to whether or not the Nation should cut back on other areas of anticipated spending.

The editorial raises an important warning in this connection:

August 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4443

and Training Act (MDTA) class of 1965 in radio and TV servicing, which was taught in the Connelley Vocational Technical High School in Pittsburgh.

Because of recent criticisms we have heard on various programs designed to help the unemployed and disadvantaged among us, I feel the Members of Congress would appreciate the message these students felt impelled to send.

When the Manpower Development and Retraining Act programs were in their early stages, there were some rough spots that had to be smoothed out—but now that we have had our trial and error period, success stories are appearing throughout the Nation. This, I am sure, will be the pattern followed in our more recent endeavors to help others not eligible under Manpower Development and Training Act.

The students, in expressing their thanks to certain individuals, stated "We know there are many more," and because our last recorded vote on amendment to the Manpower Development and Training Act program showed a unanimous House, this letter is actually directed to each Member. For this reason I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CONNELLEY VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL
HIGH SCHOOL, MDTA,
Pittsburgh, Pa., June 25, 1965.
Manpower retraining program.

DEAR SIR: We, the members of the manpower retraining program class of 1965, radio and TV servicing, wish to express our sincere thanks to all who made possible and were a part of this program. That the program is worthy we all know, for it has put into our hands a tool or skill which will enable us to go out and meet the world with more than just our own bare hands. We particularly wish to express our appreciation to those responsible for the creation of this program; to the personnel of the State employment agency for placing us; to the administrative staff at Connelley; Mr. Saverio DonGiovanni, Mr. Edwin Riebel, Mr. L. J. Borelli, Mrs. Mary Smith, and to Mr. R. E. Beaumont our instructor who, by all means in his power, did drive the know-how of this craft into us, for which we are indeed grateful. We know that there were many more who contributed toward this program of whom we know not and to them also we wish to express our appreciation.

Sincerely,

Ronald J. Adamsky; Robert W. Hughes;
Henry Kondy; Fred A. Knoll; Adam
Visokis; Carter Augustine; O. Wayne
Strawden; Frederick Hoffman; Peter J.
Kochick; LaVaughn M. Turner; Richard
Chappel; Robert W. Domhoff;
Richard Cline; Arthur H. Eichenberg.

Proud To Be an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 10, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the flow of eulogies of our late Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, has produced some of the best writing that we have seen in many years. These eulogies speak well for the stature of the art in American journalism.

Mr. Stevenson, a master of English rhetoric himself, would have been proud of this journalistic effort by Mr. Robert Lerner.

I should like today to add to the Record a eulogy written by Mr. Lerner for the Lerner Newspapers in Chicago. It can readily be seen that young Mr. Lerner has indeed inherited a legacy of the pen from his late father, Leo Lerner, who was considered one of America's outstanding writers.

Mr. Robert Lerner has brightly captured the true spirit of Adlai Stevenson in this magnificent eulogy of the former governor of Illinois. Mr. Lerner demonstrates that the principle of his father has been preserved in the image of his son.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lerner's very impressive eulogy to Adlai Stevenson follows:

PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN

(By Robert M. Lerner)

What kind of tombstone do you erect for Adlai Stevenson? A mass of granite, a pile of books, a collection of flags? The dirt of more than 100 nations upon his grave? Do we pile flowers of affection in tribute to a man who gave the world his soul, and finally asked for nothing more than to sit on the grass with a glass of wine and watch people dance?

Do we make contributions to UNESCO and UNICEF, and rename parks and playgrounds, streets and civic buildings. Do we establish scholarships for highminded young people who will try to make public service their career? Do we build a monument in Washington or Springfield, do we write eulogies for public bodies, do we fire the cannons in ancient salute?

And what men, of what wit and literary accomplishment, are worthy enough to write the tributes to the man whose wisdom they borrowed, whose humor they stole, and whose integrity lifted them above their own mortal standards and made them proud?

Just as in the fateful days after the death of President John F. Kennedy, a thousand editorial writers on a thousand newspapers sit with tears in their eyes unable to find words to convey what they feel. The memories flood, but the words don't—1952, the Draft Stevenson committee; 1956, the loss they knew would be sustained; 1960, the obvious convention defeat but the beauty of the little people who begged for Stevenson in quiet demonstration in Los Angeles.

And the man who made famous the hole in the shoe frightened Mr. K. out of the one he didn't pound on the table.

Stevenson was a real American, not a phony flag waver. As the United Nations Ambassador he performed brilliantly, upholding American foreign policy with his greatest ability, even when in his heart many of us knew he disagreed with it in part.

And Adlai became a politician, too. In the back rooms of the United Nations he could trade votes, convince recalcitrant delegates, and play power politics in a manner that makes a precinct captain out of Boss Tweed. For his country, nothing was beneath Adlai Stevenson. When he spoke in anger it was our anger, and when he spoke in praise, it was our common eloquence.

We called him "governor" because he was most proud of that office, for that was the office to which he was elected by the people.

Was Adlai Stevenson an "egghead," a member of the "intelligentsia," an "aristocrat," and too far over the heads of the people to serve the public trust?

Never. He was the Nation in every sense—and he had the best of manners and best of taste to underscore his courage and his sympathy. During the 1964 convention it was he who was selected to deliver the eulogy for Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, for only he could say

the kind of thing that had to be said, in the manner that would be appropriate and memorable.

Adlai was a humorist, and we loved him for it. But that was his camaraderie, not the complete man; at his most profound and dynamic, we preferred Stevenson the honorable American, the man who took the issue to heart and without a single smile whipped into the enemies of the Republic or defended its principles.

Now let no man write his eulogy for no one can cut out his own heart and lay it on the altar of humanity. Let no man erect his tombstone for no man can chisel into it what must be there—although, in his way, a small child might.

For myself, I wore my buttonhole shoe today, a memory of glorious campaigns of the past, a memory of the sensitive man who made me proud to be an American.

I remember the tombstone erected to the selfless village dentist in Thornton Wilder's "Our Town," who had second floor offices where for decades he practiced hard for little if any fees, and lived on love rather than money. They put his shingle over his simple grave, and by changing the name maybe we should have a simple shingle that reads:

"Adlai Stevenson, Office Upstairs."

A Menacing Power Play

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Record at this point an editorial from the Washington Post of August 10, 1965, in the hope that many Members will read and, in the reading, take cognizance of the problem so ably stated in the editorial.

In my judgment, failure to preserve the authority of the Federal Power Commission over rates for electrical energy moving in interstate commerce would constitute grave disservice to the consuming public. It would leave them naked of protection they are not only entitled to expect of their Government, but which they must have if they are to receive value for their dollars. The very nature of the electrical industry is that under either Federal or State regulation, its right to adequate profit is fully protected. No State government has the legal means to protect the consumers within its boundaries from gouging which could take place on the price of energy imported into the State. Only the Federal Power Commission can perform that important chore. The public interest will not be served through the enactment of the bills mentioned in the editorial.

The editorial follows:

A MENACING POWER PLAY

If the lobby of State regulatory officials and private power companies is successful, the Senate will enact a measure that would for all practical purposes end the control which the Federal Power Commission now exercises over electric power rates. And without effective rate regulation by the FPC, there will be a sharp increase in the \$14 billion electric bill that is now paid by the Nation's households, business enterprises, Government agencies, and nonprofit institutions.

August 10, 1965

A4445

Finally, we must remember that Vietnam is only one danger spot. Defense spending must not be held down by stripping units here or abroad that may be needed for other crises. That would be economy of the most false and dangerous sort.

Many voices in and out of Congress, military and nonmilitary, have been questioning the status of our military readiness. The Los Angeles Times by raising this question serves a very useful purpose in alerting our leaders and the people that it is a question which must be recognized and considered. False economies in defense would not only hurt our military readiness, but could tempt potential aggressors into believing that we either lack the capability or willingness to defend our interests.

Under leave to extend my remarks I submit the editorial from the August 3, 1965, issue of the Los Angeles Times for inclusion in the Record:

ECONOMY SET FOR VIETNAM WAR

War, by its nature, is a dirty and dangerous business. For the men who do the fighting, the expanding conflict in Vietnam will not be any different.

However, the war may have remarkably little impact on the Nation's economic life unless it escalates far beyond what is now contemplated.

Not that it won't be expensive.

The direct cost of fighting the war was running, until lately, around \$1 billion a year. This did not include the cost of maintaining the Navy's 7th Fleet, the jet bombers on Guam and Okinawa, and the long supply line reaching from America.

With U.S. involvement growing, the cost will grow—by just how much is unclear, although officials have been talking in terms of \$1.5 or \$2 billion extra. (Some key lawmakers say it will be much more.)

The surprising fact is that America's economy is so vast, and is growing so rapidly that a considerable effort can be absorbed without a noticeable burden on our people.

The explanation is that we are starting this time from a much higher level of preparedness and national income.

When the war in Korea began in 1950, the American military machine had been practically dismantled, and the defense budget had to be quadrupled. Today, we have a large permanent defense establishment, and it is doing much of the fighting in Vietnam.

Our gross national product—the total value of what we all produce—was \$285 billion in 1950. Today, it is approaching \$660 billion. This means that today's defense budget is well under 10 percent of our gross national product, compared with 14 to 18 percent in the Korean war and 40 percent during World War II.

The national income is still soaring. At present tax rates, Federal revenues are expected to increase by \$7 billion a year. Thus, we can pay for a considerable jump in Vietnam war costs by merely foregoing a hoped-for future tax cut.

Supplies of a few industrial materials may be in shorter supply, but the guessing is that consumer goods won't be affected, and wage and price controls will not be needed.

Some warning flags must be hoisted, however.

Present estimates of the war costs, and of future tax collections, may prove overly optimistic. President Johnson may have to be more forceful in discouraging strikes, unwarranted price increases, and inflationary wage settlements.

It may turn out, too, that the President will have to hold back Great Society spending, however much it pains him.

Finally, we must remember that Vietnam is only one danger spot. Defense spending must not be held down by stripping units here or abroad that may be needed for other crises. That would be economy of the most false and dangerous sort.

A Record of Accomplishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, if this Congress were to adjourn today, if it were to adjourn without acting on a single further measure, it would stand without question as one of the most productive sessions of any Congress in our entire history. Enactment of a strong voting rights bill, of health protection for our older citizens and of new approaches to improving the educational opportunities of our children would alone mark this as a Congress of achievement. But the list is much longer and its length is equaled in most respects by its quality.

This does not mean, of course, that there is no further work to be done. Reform of our immigration laws, further protection for our dwindling natural resources, improvement and extensions of our unemployment compensation system, and stronger and more equitable protection for our migrant farmworkers all demand attention and action.

But at a time when we are faced with both a difficult and dangerous situation in Vietnam, I believe it is appropriate to call attention to the fact that Congress has been acting responsibly and vigorously on those issues which are its direct and primary responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I include a thoughtful editorial by the New York Times distinguished columnist, Mr. James Reston, which speaks further to this point:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 6, 1965]

WASHINGTON: THE QUIET REVOLUTION

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, August 5.—President Johnson is beginning to make Franklin Roosevelt's early legislative record look like an abject failure. He's getting everything through the Congress but the abolition of the Republican Party, and he hasn't tried that yet.

It is a political miracle. It has even surpassed his own expectations, which were not modest, and while he's still a long way from achieving a Great Society, he is at least making progress toward a more equal and compassionate society.

In a single evening this week, the Senate passed the most liberal voting rights bill in the history of the Republic, and sustained the Supreme Court's ruling that the State legislatures must be reapportioned to give equal voting rights to the steeply rising urban and suburban population of the Nation.

AN IMPRESSIVE RECORD

In this first session of the 89th Congress, the Federal legislature has also passed the medical care bill under social security, a housing bill with an experimental system of Federal rent subsidies for the poor, education

and poverty bills that bypass the ancient conflict over Federal aid to religious institutions, a constitutional amendment to deal at long last with the danger of Presidential disability, a bill for the relief of the depressed areas of Appalachia—all this and a lot more and a tax cut too.

Mr. Johnson is giving us a revolution in the binding of a hymn book. He has broken the consolidating spirit of the Eisenhower era. He has sounded more conservative but acted more radical than his mentor, Roosevelt, and he has presided over more legislative innovations on the home front than any other President in any other single session of the Congress in this century.

This is not, of course, due entirely to Lyndon Baines Johnson's particular brand of political magic, though that hasn't hurt. The New Deal's day has finally come. The radical ideas of the early thirties are now winning instead of losing. There seems to be a new sense of social responsibility in the country—a growing feeling that racial discrimination, bad education, inadequate medical care and degrading poverty are intolerable in a fabulously wealthy Nation.

Other factors have helped. The Democratic landslide in the Presidential election of 1964 gave the President's party large majorities in the House and Senate; the new Members in the 89th Congress have been overwhelmingly for the President's program; the old conservative coalition of the southern Democrats and middle western Republicans has been broken, and the Republican leadership has not only gone along with but sometimes has led the fight for equal civil rights.

This is a development of worldwide significance. It is not so long ago that students of government in other lands were perplexed about the erratic nature of the American economy, the verbal violence of American politics, and what they regarded as the rigidity of the American Constitution.

THE DOUBTERS

They were not sure that the United States could maintain economic growth and stability, that it would apply to new techniques of tax and monetary policy, that it could provide continuity of purpose from one political party to the other, or that a Federal Government of proud and numerous States with an attic full of hobgoblins about the welfare state and the planned economy, could achieve social progress over an entire continent and bring its military power to the defense of freedom in other parts of the world.

Well, it begins to look as if the people will take the welfare state and the planned economy if you just don't mention the names, mainly because, wicked or not, they seem to work. The gross national product rose by \$9.2 billion in the second quarter of 1965—from a 1964 level of \$622 billion to an annual rate of \$658 billion.

THE OLD ASSUMPTIONS

Something, in short, seems to have happened to the old popular assumptions that the American economy wouldn't work if the Government tinkered with it; that the White House and the Congress couldn't get along unless both were reorganized; that Federal money couldn't be channeled to the private and parochial schools without the immediate retaliation of a vengeful God.

So maybe there's some zip in the old system yet. In his state of the Union message, President Johnson said the time had come to give more attention to the home front. He promised to try to keep the economy growing, to extend the prosperity to more people, and to try to improve the quality of life for all. And even his critics here concede he has kept his promise.

China Hews at Its High Birth Rate**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, by now it has become clear that the solution of economic problems facing developing countries of the world lies in the establishment of an effective program to control the ever-spiraling rate of birth. Indeed, it has been said that that country which first solves its population problem will take the lead in providing a better life for all of its citizens. The case of Japan is particularly instructive.

Some years ago that nation launched a full-scale birth control program which halved its birth rate in a decade; Japan is currently enjoying an unprecedented prosperity. The fifth in a series of six articles entitled "Our Crowded Earth," by Jean M. White, currently running in the Washington Post, discusses such programs in various developing nations around the world:

CHINA HEWS AT ITS HIGH BIRTH RATE: OUR CROWDED EARTH—V

(By Jean M. White)

If Communist China decides to throw the persuasive power of its totalitarian government behind a full-scale campaign to control population, the results could be spectacular.

There have been signs that the Chinese are coming to realize there can be weakness, not strength, in numbers.

Irene B. Taeuber, a leading demographer, thinks Communist China may be ready to launch a systematic birth-control campaign. She backs up this view in a paper being prepared for presentation at an international conference on family-planning programs in Geneva August 23 to 27.

"They now have the means with the IUD and a simple touch method of induced abortion," Mrs. Taeuber points out. "The public health network goes into every village to reach the masses. The youth can be indoctrinated through the Communist Youth League."

EARLY WEDLOCK DISCOURAGED

Early marriages are discouraged in Communist China today, and couples are encouraged to delay the first child. Party members receive no extra allowances or maternity leaves after the first two children.

What happens in Communist China could have far-reaching political consequences in the alignment between the free world and the Communist bloc. The Asian country that controls its population growth probably will be the first to achieve an economic takeoff to offer people a better life.

Philip M. Hauser, University of Chicago demographer and former Acting Director of the Census Bureau, has pointed out that the other underdeveloped countries are closely watching the race between India and Communist China.

BIRTH RATE MAY DECIDE

Both are trying to achieve a higher standard of living—one by Communist methods and the other by a modified democratic way. "Success or failure in this fateful contest may well hinge on the ability of the nations involved to decrease their rates of population growth," Hauser emphasizes.

Burdened down by a high birth rate, India is in a painful struggle to modernize for

economic growth. Its official family-planning policy has shown few results over a decade, partly because of indifferent government leadership and bureaucratic snarls.

In 1956, Communist China launched a family-planning drive, stressing contraception, sterilization, and induced abortion. In less than a year the campaign was turned off and the government turned its energies and verbiage to the "great leap forward."

The reasons for the abrupt about-face never were explained—there was a good harvest that year, the family-planning drive ran into peasant resistance, and justification required some nimble flip-flops in the Marxist line.

REVIVED ON LOWER KEY

The population-control campaign soon was revived in a lower key, with emphasis on delayed marriages and children.

In an interview last year with Journalist Edgar Snow, Premier Chou En-lai supported planned parenthood as "conducive to raising the standard of living." China, he told Snow, had sent a delegation to Japan to study how that country had reduced its birth rate. It also has had its scientists at work on a birth-control pill, Chou said.

No one knows for sure how many people live behind the Bamboo Curtain or how fast the population is growing. The estimate is that the population may be around 750 million and the growth rate about 2.5 percent.

The international political situation gives special significance to population growth, and the implications extend far beyond the race between China and India.

POOR AREAS BURSTING

Today a little more than two-thirds of the world's people live in the underdeveloped areas of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Within 35 years, these areas probably will hold four-fifths of the world population. Today 6 of every 10 new persons added to the world population are born in Asia. Another two are born in Latin America and Africa.

The overweighted racial imbalance is obvious. But more significant in the long run is the widening gap between the have and the have-not nations. This is something that could have a profound impact on world peace and world order.

Hauser points out that this widening gap between the rich and poor nations could lead to a north-south division of the world to replace the present polarity between the east and west. The have-nots now have had a glimpse of a better life; if their aspirations are blocked, they may blow off their frustrations in revolutions and convulsions of unrest.

ASIA'S BIG PROBLEM

The world's biggest population problems are concentrated in Asia, which now has 56 percent of the global population.

The only Asian nation that has succeeded in controlling its population growth is Japan. And that country—highly literate, modernized, and industrialized—cannot serve as a model to guide the other underdeveloped countries of Asia.

In just a decade, Japan halved its birth rate, the fastest decline in history. In 1947, the rate was 34.3 per 1,000 of population. Ten years later it had dropped down to nearly 17.

Japan, a crowded island with a population half that of the United States crammed into 5 percent of the land space, came out of the war with its industry smashed. More than 5 million men came home from the Pacific islands.

JAPAN ACCEPTS ABORTIONS

In 1948, the Japanese Government passed a national eugenics act that liberalized the laws on legal abortions. But even before this, the Japanese people had made their decisions and started limiting families.

The birth rate had been falling even before World War II, but rose temporarily with the postwar baby boom.

The Japanese have no religious qualms over abortion and relied largely on this method to limit their families. Now, with improvements in contraception in recent years, there are moves to encourage greater use of more conventional birth control methods. But there still are about 1 million abortions each year in Japan.

Within the last 2 or 3 years, there have been hopeful signs that other Asian nations are making gains in population control.

RATE DIPS IN HONG KONG

Taiwan and South Korea have turned to the intrauterine device (IUD) to push family planning and have expanded pilot programs into national policy. In Taiwan, the birth rate dropped from 42 per 1,000 in 1958 to 35 last year. Ceylon, with technical assistance from Sweden, is now moving ahead on its program.

In Hong Kong last year, the birth rate fell below 30 per 1,000 for the first time. This island city is incredibly congested because of the immigration of mainland refugees. It is an artificial situation, but it does point up what can happen as population swells—in low-income public housing only 24 square feet, perhaps the size of a railroad compartment, is allotted to each person.

Rats, given ample food but jammed in crowded pens, have become neurotic and frustrated and develop rat societal problems. How human society will bear up under the stress of such crowding is something for speculation.

For the present, the heart of the world's population problem does lie in Asia. But it is tropical Latin America that has the fastest rate of growth.

Though rich in space and natural resources, Latin American countries are having serious population difficulties. Their people are poor, and more and more are being born without any hope of adequate food, housing, or clothing.

The late President Kennedy took note of the situation in his 1961 message on foreign aid:

"The magnitude of the problem is staggering. In Latin America, for example, the population growth is already threatening to outpace economic growth—and in some parts of the continent living standards are actually declining."

BABY BOOM IN BRAZIL

In many South American countries the population growth rate is 3 percent or better. Brazil, the giant of South America, has a birth rate of about 45 per 1,000 and is growing at a 3.5-percent clip. At this rate, the population of 80 million will double in two decades.

On the hills around Rio de Janeiro, more and more poor crowd into the miserable slum favelas, looking down without hope on the bright lights of the beautiful city.

The picture in Latin America is grim. Some Asian nations are at least beginning to talk about their population problems. No one seems concerned in many of the Catholic countries of Latin America.

However, concern over the rising number of abortions is growing in a few countries. In Chile, which has added family-planning services in hospitals, about a fourth of the maternity beds have been occupied by post-abortion patients. The estimates are that there are three abortions to every live birth in Uruguay.

PUERTO RICO CUTS RATE

Puerto Rico, which had some pioneering private family-planning programs as early as the 1930's, has slowly reduced her birth rate. Part of the drop undoubtedly is due to the emigration of young people. But one survey has shown that 1 in 5 women between

August 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4441

creased base of technical knowledge and experience which has contributed directly to this country's military strength and economic well-being.

On such a technological foundation we have built an effective missile deterrent, whose value can be judged by the fact that we have not needed to employ it in anger. On this technological base also, we have taken a few strong strides toward developing a real space competence. The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to those who pioneered the research, the development, and the production of ballistic missiles. Had it not been for this early effort, much of it under adverse circumstances, the national space program could not have made the great advance it has made in recent years. This far-sightedness, this growth, this interrelationship of manpower and facilities, show how national assets can be put to constructive use so long as we have the will and the determination to do so.

Those who are impatient for even greater progress in space—and I am to be counted among them—should try to establish perspective by attempting to enumerate some of the many accomplishments which have taken place in less than a decade of space activities. In a sense, that reference to a period shorter than a decade is somewhat misleading as it has been much more than 10 years since we first started in rocket technology. However, it has been only recently that we have had what can really be called a viable space program. We need go back only to 1956 to find the first year in which space expenditures reached the grand total of \$100 million. Fiscal year 1965, with its expenditure figure of \$6.6 billion was only the fifth year in which space spending exceeded \$1 billion. Those few figures attest to the tremendous rate of growth of our national space program. This rapid rate of growth undoubtedly will not and should not be expected to continue, but I feel quite confident in predicting steady and constructive growth for the future. While there are indications of some leveling off of total space expenditures, it is hoped that they will continue to grow over the years at least consonant with the rate of increase in our gross national product.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

As I suggested, a quick look at space accomplishments in the last few years reveals successful satellites in communications, navigation, nuclear detection, scientific investigations, weather and other observations, radiation measurements, geodetic surveys, the garnering of data regarding the moon, Venus, and Mars, and a wide range of other space activities.

It is also worthy of note that since 1958 this country has placed more than 300 spacecraft into orbit about the earth and put 12 on escape missions. About half of that amazing total has been launched during the past 24 months.

COMPARISON WITH U.S.S.R.

As we bask in the glow of self-congratulation, however, let us not forget for a moment that the Soviets also have an orderly, balanced, and vigorous space program. Moreover, their program continues to accelerate. Instead of a slowdown, which some had predicted, the U.S.S.R. has experienced a steady expansion in its space efforts. For example, so far this year they have put almost twice as many payloads into earth orbit as they had by this time last year. Indeed, the last few weeks have shown a record amount of Soviet space activity, and I see no evidence that the pace will diminish.

Although the Soviets have not had as notable success in their escape space attempts as they have had in their earth-orbiting missions, they have put a larger percentage of their total effort into far-out space missions than we have. They are still ahead of us in manned space flight experience and

in total weight of payloads orbited, while we are ahead in number of payloads and in space applications in such areas as communications, navigation, and meteorology. Both countries have made great progress in scientific experiments, in the reliability of space equipment, and in the development of larger and more powerful launch vehicles.

NATIONAL EFFORT

Our space program is truly national in operation as well as in policy. For example, the Defense Department has developed rockets used for both their launches and for NASA's launches. The Defense Department has also supplied all the astronauts for Mercury and most of them for Gemini. Since the former is a completed program, it supplies an excellent illustration of inter-agency cooperation. In a single manned Mercury operation, 28 ships, 171 aircraft, and over 18,000 military personnel were deployed in primary and contingent recovery areas throughout the world. Those who like to find divisiveness in our space program find little comfort in the Mercury project. This was a case in which we had NASA spacecraft placed into orbit by Air Force-developed boosters, launched from an inter-agency coordinated launch site, and piloted by individuals on detail from the armed services. That cooperation was in addition to the recovery support just mentioned.

Exchange of technology and experience should be a mutual one. For example, NASA's considerable success in manned space flight could assist the Air Force substantially in the development of a manned orbiting laboratory. Such interagency cooperation should not impair our peaceful image or modify our peaceful intent.

One of the most important facts about the space program is one which is so frequently overlooked. I refer to the fact that those engaged in the program are creating national assets and national resources, which can be devoted to the best interests of this Nation—whether such use be to improve man's well-being or to protect mankind from aggression.

A GLANCE AT THE FUTURE

And now I would like to outline briefly a few general features of our space activities for the future:

1. We will not only land men on the moon, but, if conditions warrant, we will make many other trips to explore the various parts of the lunar surface and possibly establish a base or bases there.
2. We will not only send unmanned probes throughout the solar system to learn more about the planets, but we will send manned expeditions into space wherever they seem feasible.
3. We will develop a growing family of manned earth-orbiting stations, from relatively small orbiting laboratories to large multimanned permanent stations. We would expect to operate a regular ferry service to transfer personnel and supplies to and from such stations on a regular basis.
4. Global communications via satellites will be a fact in the very near future and should be followed soon by direct broadcast of both voice and TV by satellite to home receivers throughout large sections of the world.
5. The future will find us in a continuing rate of growth in improved propulsion—faster, more powerful rockets using nuclear as well as chemical energy.
6. Orbiting spacecraft will increase annually in numbers, in size, and in sophistication. Through such activity we will greatly increase our knowledge about the earth as well as about the heavens.
7. We can expect a marriage of the major features of both aeronautics and astronautics. In other words, lifting bodies and winged spacecraft with maneuverable re-

entry ability will be launched into near and distant space by means of recoverable and reusable launch vehicles. Drastic reduction in the cost of space travel will result. And, finally,

8. As our competence in space increases and as such competence becomes part of the institutional structure not only of this country but of many countries throughout the world, we can expect to see greater economic progress and international cooperation. Then we can truly say that our space efforts have made major contributions to world peace.

In the coming sessions of this symposium, highly complex and technical subjects will undoubtedly be explored. I am sure they will be stimulating and productive. As you pursue these scientific and engineering intricacies, I hope you will keep in mind some of the policy implications and national objectives which I have touched upon this morning.

For the House
Welcome Moves in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am no expert on the complex and unhappy situation that our Government faces in Vietnam. I am however, as we all are, deeply concerned—concerned about the waste and destruction that comes with war, concerned about the lives of young Americans, concerned about the safety and well-being of all people.

Sensible men everywhere agree that peace and stable democratic government in South Vietnam are the ultimate American objectives. I was greatly heartened, therefore, to read an editorial in last Friday's *Christain Science Monitor* indicating that the first step toward a meaningful peace—negotiation—is closer than ever before. The points made in the *Monitor* editorial were new to me, and they may be new to many of my colleagues. With this in mind, I would like to call the editorial to their attention. It reveals at least a ray of hope in a dark and gloomy picture:

WELCOME MOVES

There is at least one welcome and hopeful aspect to the Vietnamese situation today. This is that never before has there been as widespread an effort to bring all concerned to the negotiating table as there is at the present moment.

Leaving aside the continuing American readiness to begin unconditional discussions for peace, there are no less than three peace moves afoot. The first of these are the quiet soundings which United Arab Republic President Nasser is making in both Peking and Hanoi. He is doing so at the behest of Yugoslavia's President Tito and India's Prime Minister Shastri. The second is the recent visit of a representative of Ghana's President Nkrumah to North Vietnamese President Ho Chi Minh. The third is the reinvigorated United Nations initiative following President Johnson's recent letter to Secretary General U Thant.

There is not as yet any indication that any of these efforts have swayed Communist China, North Vietnam or the Vietcong to a more reasonable stance. All three still speak of total victory and continue to lay down

A4442

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 10, 1965

patently impossible conditions for peace talks.

Yet we do not believe that these various initiatives are either fruitless or a waste of time. If nothing else, they are proof that wider and wider segments of world opinion are ready to step forward and help find a solution to perhaps the thorniest international problem on the globe today. They also indicate that this same world opinion increasingly recognizes that the greatest roadblocks to peace talks do not lie in Washington but in Peking and Hanoi. They also prove to these latter that Communist efforts to line up world opinion against the American position have so far not been particularly successful.

These constructive efforts on the part of Asian, African, and European statesmen underline President Johnson's wisdom in declaring that America will neither carry on all-out war in Vietnam nor engage in total withdrawal. To do the former would grievously offend much of world opinion. To do the latter would reward aggression and render future American pledges worthless.

Thus a gradual increase in American military pressure plus a continued readiness to begin honorable and reasonable peace talks at any time seem a combination well suited both to impress the Communist powers and to encourage further peace efforts by well-intentioned neutrals.

Rules Committee and Culture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial that appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, August 8, regarding the status of legislation to establish a National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities.

This legislation, which was recently approved by the Senate, has broad, bipartisan support. In addition, President Johnson has endorsed the proposal as a vital part of his Great Society program.

Under permission granted, I include this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

RULES COMMITTEE AND CULTURE

A bill that would establish a National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities is now before the House Rules Committee. The administration bill, passed by a voice vote in the Senate and endorsed by a large number of Representatives, should be brought to the House floor in the near future.

The Foundation would consist of an endowment for the arts and an endowment for the humanities, each administered by a 24-member council. The councils would be authorized to make grants that could total \$10 million a year with the objective of encouraging and supporting the Nation's cultural commitment. Advocates of the legislation, pointing to Federal support of the sciences, claim that although the sum of money involved is not large when spread throughout the 50 States, formal Federal recognition of the importance of the arts and the humanities will help right the balance with the sciences and the grants will provide an incentive for increased private, State and local spending on culture.

As an important part of President Johnson's Great Society program, as a major innovation and as a Federal involvement in an area which the U.S. Government has traditionally avoided, the proposed Foundation deserves to be fully considered before the rush toward adjournment begins.

Merchant Marine Still Vitally Necessary

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, many times in recent years I have heard it stated by persons in Government that the American merchant marine has served its part in the Nation's defense. "We can do without ships now," these people say. "They are too slow. We have airpower now sufficient to take care of any military needs," they argue.

Anyone with a reasonable modicum of sense knows, of course, that statements like this are foolish. Day by day, news reports indicate the need for ships to take our men and military supplies to Vietnam.

Along this line is a story in the Baltimore Sun of August 4, by the Sun's maritime editor, Helen Delich Bentley, concerning the shipment of the 1st Cavalry—Airmobile—Division, by sea. The division's 400 helicopters and practically all its supplies will be sent by sea. Only a limited number of advance personnel will make the trip by air.

The Sun article, inserted below, speaks for itself—and no one speaks more clearly and convincingly as to the need for adequate shipping support of every military movement overseas than Mrs. Bentley, long one of America's leading shipping experts:

THE 1ST CAVALRY TO GO BY SEA—DIVISION TO EMBARK SOON FOR VIET WAR

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

WASHINGTON, August 3.—The 1st Cavalry (Airmobile) Division, its 400 helicopters and all of its support supplies, will be sent to Vietnam by sea with embarkation of the troops to begin next week.

Only a "limited number of advance personnel" will make the 6,000-mile trip by air.

President Johnson last week announced that he ordered the 1st Cavalry Division immediately to the Vietnam front. It will be the first full division on the battle scene, a Department of Defense spokesman said tonight. There are units of divisions but no full division there, he added.

PORTS NAMED

The first units of the 1st Cavalry Division, stationed at Fort Benning, Ga., will be embarked in the ports of Charleston, S.C., and Savannah, Ga., aboard at least two of the six troop transports that are being removed from their normal Atlantic operation to enter Vietnam service.

Loading of the helicopters will also take place next week aboard the Navy aircraft carrier *Boxer* in Mayport, the naval base adjacent to Jacksonville, Fla., and aboard Military Sea Transportation Service aircraft ferries at Mobile, Ala.

Aircraft engineering personnel will accom-

pany the craft loaded on each of the vessels. In addition, some 35 to 40 formerly strike-bound freighters have been chartered by the MSTs to pick up the support equipment needed for the 1st Cavalry Division and the units already in Vietnam.

TO GET SUPPLIES

Those loading for the division will pick up their supplies at east and gulf seaports also beginning next week, it was said.

The six troop transports are capable of handling an entire division of 15,000 men by a simple conversion which requires about 24 hours of work by the ship's crew. It is referred to as "immediate emergency berthing" and enables the crew to make necessary changes to the cabins and troop quarters that will permit them to at least double their normal capacity when carrying military personnel.

COUP FOR SHIPPERS

The fact that the first major movement of troops being sent to the Asian battlefield is going by sea rather than air is considered a major coup for the shipping industry which has been waging an uphill campaign emphasizing the continuing need of passenger ships as well as cargo vessels for defense purposes.

More than 4 years ago, Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, told a congressional committee that there was no further need to build or subsidize American-flag passenger ships because all troop movement in the future would go by air.

A year later at the height of the Cuban missile crisis, the Defense Department had alerted the owners of American-flag passenger liners to "stand by" for their employment if troops were to be sent to the nearby Caribbean island.

The SS *United States*, which has been immobilized by a seamen's strike since June, is capable of transporting an entire division with all of its equipment after only 1 week of conversion work to transform her from a luxurious Atlantic liner to a troop transport.

TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND TRANSPORTED

The 6 troop transports which are being removed from their regular Atlantic services ferried 200,000 military personnel and their dependents between Europe and the United States last year. They are all operated by the Military Sea Transportation Service.

Should it become necessary to provide more space in each of these transports, they will have to be sent to shipyards so additional decks can be welded in their holds.

Then the capacity of each again will be doubled.

In addition to the 35 to 40 "strikebound" freighters, 15 additional cargo ships have been taken out of the reserve fleets and are being reactivated in private shipyards for participation in the Vietnam crisis.

The 1st Cavalry Division with the "Airmobile" inserted in the middle of its name is described as being "a new organization with a very large group of helicopters" and a "fast-moving light outfit."

Manpower Retraining Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1965

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I received a letter from the students of the Manpower Development

to discourage future "wars of national liberation"?

Does our basic purpose require the aim of literally suppressing guerrillas throughout South Vietnam? If so, are we willing to commit the huge military force required to police such inhospitable terrain against an enemy who rises and vanishes like a will-o'-the-wisp?

Is it our aim merely to force the Communists to negotiate, ignoring that negotiations are an instrument of policy and not a substitute for it? What kind of negotiated settlement would indeed be consistent with our proclaimed fundamental objective? Surely not the "graceful" withdrawal some urge, nor any kind of elections Communists have ever consented to in areas they control, nor a coalition government vulnerable to Communist coup. And if a settlement did meet our objectives, would the Communists agree to it while they still have the means for military mischief?

The question of war aims exposes the cruel dilemma of the Vietnamese war. It may be that the military goals which would accomplish our grand purposes can be won only by much larger forces than we so far have been willing to commit. The aims our current forces can attain might throw away or seriously compromise the fundamental objective which justifies our fighting in the first place. This dilemma, in turn, threatens the same imprecision of purpose which has so plagued American wars in the past.

Given the whole murky situation, the imprecision is perhaps understandable. Perhaps, though it seems a long shot, the latest addition of troops will be enough to paper over the problems. The administration may well feel that it's best to buy time before facing the decision of whether to compromise its larger purposes or take the larger risks those purposes imply. Whatever the eventualities, it is myopic to question the justice in our basic purpose of trying to check the Communists often enough to dull their lust for world enslavement.

All the same, the history of American wars rings with a warning: When we send troops to fight, much of their sacrifice may be in vain unless our leaders have a clear idea of what, exactly, we are fighting to accomplish.

Ambassador George J. Feldman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was honored, delighted and truly grateful yesterday to be privileged to attend the swearing-in ceremonies of my dear, cherished and esteemed friend of long standing, the Honorable George J. Feldman, newly appointed Ambassador of the United States to the historic nation of Malta. He will be our first Ambassador to this important post.

Ambassador Feldman comes to the distinguished post for which President Johnson has so wisely appointed him, with a most impressive record of successful endeavors in the practice of law, in business and in the public service.

It is my good fortune to have known George Feldman since his early youth when he was first associated with our mutual, great and dearly beloved friend,

the late eminent David I. Walsh, for many years the illustrious U.S. Senator from the great State of Massachusetts.

As a career public servant, the new Ambassador made a most auspicious start during the time he was with Senator Walsh, and early marked himself as a young man of outstanding ability and dedication.

George Feldman is highly trained and educated, and is endowed with a fine legal mind. He is a well-known legal scholar and writer, a very successful lawyer who has handled with great distinction many important legal causes.

His opinions, views and specialized knowledge, have been frequently sought by eminent counsel and by congressional committees.

At a great sacrifice to himself and his devoted family he came to Washington to serve in the initial stages of the organization of the House Committee on Science and Aeronautics, first launched under the leadership of my late, esteemed beloved friend and colleague on the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable Overton Brooks, of Louisiana, and later by another very distinguished House Armed Services colleague and dearly beloved friends of mine, the esteemed and outstanding gentleman from California, the Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER.

During this experience, Mr. Feldman made invaluable contributions to the work of this new epochmaking, pioneer committee which has done such tremendously valuable work in fearlessly extending outward into the deep, infinite reaches of space the presence and handiwork of man. Only the Lord himself could predict where this great adventure may lead mankind.

Mr. Feldman also served as one of the original trustees of Comsat, a most important, vital adjunct of the space program which has brought nations much closer together through the transmission of radio and televisions from long distances across continents and oceans from widely separated areas of the world.

George Feldman has engaged also as a brilliant leader in many religious and charitable activities and humanity causes to which he has lent his great talents, abilities, generosity, and dedicated and inspiring spirit.

In him, the President has made a magnificent selection of a great American to represent the United States at Malta and in our diplomatic service, and I know that he will achieve great success in this role as he has done in other positions of great trust and responsibility to which he has been called in the past.

I appreciated and was deeply impressed by the remarks at the exercises of the very distinguished Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk, who on this occasion spoke so eloquently, feelingly and appropriately concerning Mr. Feldman's record of achievement and high qualifications and spirit of dedication and broad experience and warmly welcomed him to the Department of State.

All of us who know George Feldman realize his fine qualities as a human being and his constant search for ways and means to offer his talents and serv-

ices to the inarticulate and the helpless, who are not always able to speak and act for themselves in ways to promote their well-being and interests and thus strengthen the moral bonds of the Nation.

His charming, gracious wife will be of constant support and assistance and help to Ambassador Feldman as he discharges his most important duties and his lovely son and daughter will round out a very happy partnership which, I am sure, will do a magnificent job in strengthening the bonds between the United States and Malta and promoting the interests and posture of our Nation in the important area in which the new Ambassador will serve.

I feel very happy and confident that my valued and dear friend, George Feldman, will give an excellent account of himself in his distinguished ambassadorial post and measure up to the highest standards and traditions of our great diplomatic service of which he is now such a distinguished leader.

In heartily congratulating Ambassador Feldman, his gracious wife and family, I wish them Godspeed and every measure of good fortune in their new tasks, and I hope and pray that the good Lord will shower upon them his choicest blessings of good health, success, happiness, and noble achievement in the great work which they are undertaking for many years to come.

The Cost of Vietnam

The Cost of Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in a difficult struggle against a relentless enemy in Vietnam. We are being challenged in a difficult type of warfare on an unfavorable terrain. It is a test of our commitment at its most vulnerable link.

It is a test against an enemy convinced that we cannot and will not fight his kind of war, where the innocent farmer by day becomes the ruthless terrorist by night, where the enemy is seldom seen, yet sniper fire, mines and booby traps give evidence that he is everywhere.

Victory against this type of enemy will not come easily, quickly, or cheaply. This must be made clear to the American people. Therefore, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article by Hanson Baldwin in the August 6, 1965, New York Times, which gives a realistic idea of the price tag in Vietnam.

The article follows:

THE COST OF VIETNAM—ARMED FORCES ESTIMATE THAT EXTRA \$12 BILLION MUST BE APPROPRIATED

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The Armed Services have estimated that additional appropriations of more than \$12 billion will be needed over a period of several years to finance the war in Vietnam and to remedy existing or potential military defi-

August 10, 1965

ciencies. President Johnson requested this week \$1.7 billion more for the current fiscal year's budget to meet some of the extraordinary costs of the Vietnamese war. Last spring about \$700 million was provided by Congress as a supplemental appropriation for the last fiscal year. Next January a supplemental appropriation for \$2 to \$4 billion will be needed, the administration has indicated.

The total additional funds so far requested—\$2.4 billion—will come nowhere near meeting all the needs of the services, it was generally agreed yesterday by officers and a number of Senators.

Last Sunday Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, estimated that the price tag of the Vietnamese war "could easily reach \$10 or \$12 billion."

Senator JOHN STENNIS, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, agreed that military spending for Vietnam might run at the rate of \$10 to \$14 billion annually, between now and January 1, or about \$800 million to \$1.2 billion a month.

Senator STENNIS, whose subcommittee has conducted a long study of service shortages, mentioned trucks, spare parts, and various weapons as the type of equipment in short supply, and said it was "time to remedy those shortages."

REASONS FOR SHORTAGE

Military men cite specific reasons for the current shortages. They mention the failure to provide extra funds over the course of the last 2 years for the increasing expenditures in Vietnam, the marked reduction of defense stocks and inventories required by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara in the last 4 years, and a decision to limit procurement funds to a fraction of what was required for the acquisition of all new weapons, supplies and equipment, and for annual replacement of over-age equipment.

Senator RUSSELL's figure of a \$10 to \$12 billion cost for the Vietnamese war is believed to have been derived in part from the rough calculation made by the services, prior to the President's recent decision to send 50,000 more troops to Vietnam, that an extra \$12 billion will be needed to cover a period of several years to remedy all existing deficiencies.

This figure, which was viewed as "utopian" by some civilian officials, has been met so far by the President's official request for an additional \$1.7 billion and an indication that more billions will be asked next January.

The services agree that, as yet, there are no significant shortages in Vietnam, except for specialized items such as the new jungle boot. But there is considerable worry about the state of the 7th Army in Germany, about the Atlantic Fleet, and about strategic Reserve units in this country.

These have played "second fiddle" to Vietnam, service sources say, and the very fine line that once existed between peacetime adequacy and insufficiency for wartime or for national emergency is disappearing.

There are no reserve stocks of certain types of ammunition, which are being shipped almost directly from the factory to Vietnam. The World War II-Korean war stockpiles of conventional bombs and other weapons are being depleted rapidly and new production lines to replace them have barely started.

Furthermore, the reserve stocks of newer types of weapons, such as certain types of missiles, are said to be very low.

The Air Force, Navy, and Army are concerned about the lack of replacements for types of aircraft now being used in Vietnam. In one day's attacks recently, six Republic F-105 Thunderchief fighter-bombers were lost to ground fire.

The production line of the Thunderchief closed down sometime ago; the only avail-

able replacement for this plane, outside of the very small Air Force Reserve, is one Air National Guard squadron of 19 planes.

More than 6 months ago the Navy urged the reopening of a production line for the Douglas propeller-driven Skyraider, which is flown in Vietnam by the Navy, the Air Force, and the Vietnamese. But no more Skyraiders have been manufactured, although according to some estimates about 200 more could be used now in Vietnam.

The Martin B-57 light bomber has long been out of production; those that have been lost in Vietnam have been replaced, so far, by converting photoreconnaissance B-57 planes flown by the Air National Guard to bombers.

New types of aircraft, some of them still under development or unproven in war, may be substituted for those models now out of production. The Northrop F-5 and a new Navy attack plane—the Ling-Temco-Vought A-7A—and the Grumman A-6 may fill some of the gaps, with the help of the older North American F-100 and the Navy's A-4E light attack plane.

The Navy's new Grumman A-6A attack plane and a high-speed fighter, the McDonnell F-4, are in limited production, which could be increased fairly rapidly.

A new counterinsurgency plane may also be ordered and many more helicopters and light Army aircraft are needed. In addition, 2.75-inch rockets, 750-pound bombs and small caliber ammunition are also in short supply.

The shortages of trained personnel, which were becoming acute because of the large turnover each year and the priority demands of Vietnam, will be met gradually under the President's program by providing funds for some 340,000 more men for the regular services.

These are to be acquired, according to present plans by increased draft calls, intensified recruiting and a limited extension of naval enlistments. However, the existing severe shortages in certain categories of specialists may continue for months to come.

Vietnam has received priority in all these specialties, but the drain has made itself felt elsewhere. It has been estimated by the Army that the captains and majors assigned to Vietnam would staff more than three divisions; there are consequent shortages in these ranks in Europe and in this country.

The 72d Birthday of the Honorable Wright Patman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1965

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the sixth day of August marked the 72d birthday of the dean of the Texas delegation, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN.

WRIGHT PATMAN came to the Congress in 1929 and only three Members now serve in the House who were here when WRIGHT PATMAN arrived.

His achievements in this 37 years of service would take many pages to detail. He has served with distinction on the Committee on Banking and Currency which he now chairs. Despite the heavy work schedule which his committee chairmanship demands, he has never failed to provide his constituents, singly and collectively, with outstanding repre-

sentation. He attends to the needs of his district with great care.

He has also contributed two of the most outstanding books on the subject of the Federal Government. "How Our Laws Are Made" and "Our American Government" continue to be two of the most popular publications in their field.

I could talk for hours about the accomplishments and the distinction of this great public servant. His competence and his dedicated service, however, are well known to the Members of the House. As a relatively young member of the Texas delegation, I offer my congratulations and my best wishes to my dean.

Renaissance in Long Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the 20th century has been chided and berated for failing to appreciate the arts; we no longer look to the poet or the stage for inspiration; we are called an age without esthetic values. And in these precarious times, especially, we need the bard to call attention to the beauty we are ignoring and the foibles of human nature we are oblivious to, the pathos and drama of our daily lives.

It was a thrilling experience, therefore, to be privy to a whole new Renaissance in my own backyard. Through the cooperative efforts of the American National Theater and Academy, and the North Shore Community Arts Center of Roslyn, N.Y., the development of professional theater of quality is being pursued and perfected on Long Island.

With the advent of radio and television, the death knell of the traveling troubador sounded. But the imaginative and creative efforts of dedicated individuals are being pooled today in a project that is worthy of emulation on a nationwide scale. The State University of New York at Farmingdale has graciously lent the use of its facilities. The Courtyard Theater, after months of preparation, was on Saturday, August 7, revealed in all its splendor, presenting "The Shavian Woman in Love and Marriage." A superb performance by Jo Ann Sayres and others capped a refreshing evening.

We of the suburbs have often been called Babbitts—the Courtyard Theater should prove to many that Bosell would be a better analogy. To the Greater New York Chapter of ANTA, Virginia Inness-Brown, president, and the North Shore Community Arts Center, Stanley Swerdlow, Nettie Good, Norma Reiner, Irving Stewart, Harriet Rosenson, Miriam Belenky, Judith M. Levitan, belongs the credit for still another innovation in bringing the arts to our community.

I commend to my colleagues careful study of this project. It is a refreshing breeze of the best in American community spirit. We are the richer for it.

August 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

19147

Mr. Speaker, last year the average pay of employees in manufacturing averaged \$2.53 per hour while the earnings of all farm labor and management averaged \$1.05. When the bakers and truckers and labor demanded and received a raise, the baking companies did not go out of business. But now they are intimidating their employees with threats to close down their plants.

Mr. Speaker, I say again the salary and additional compensation of the president of Nabisco went from \$123,000 a year to \$175,000. There are not very many farmers in this country who can report a corresponding increase in profit in personal earnings.

Fe O'Hara
REPORT FROM VIETNAM BY THE
CLERGYMEN'S EMERGENCY COMMITTEE

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Jacob J. Weinstein, rabbi of Temple KAM in the district I have the honor to represent, has returned from Vietnam as a member of a clergymen's emergency committee of 12 Americans and 1 international associate representing the World Council of Churches.

Rabbi Weinstein is one of the outstanding spiritual leaders of the Nation. He has been on National Advisory Committees named by Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, the voice and conscience of the United States at the United Nations, is a member of Temple KAM and a long-time close friend of Rabbi Weinstein.

I am extending my remarks to include, first, the letter to the Central Conference of American Rabbis, of which Rabbi Weinstein is president, transmitting the report of the clergymen on their findings in Vietnam; second, the report of the clergymen; and, third, the names and identification of the participants in the Vietnam project.

The letter to the Central Conference of American Rabbis, 790 Madison Avenue, New York, follows:

JULY 30, 1965.

DEAR COLLEAGUES: I am pleased to enclose a copy of the report which was issued by the clergymen's emergency committee for Vietnam, under the auspices of the fellowship of reconciliation, on which body I was privileged to represent the conference. I hope that you will, if you agree with it, make its content known to your congregation.

I was immensely impressed with the unanimity of feeling on the part of the religious leaders, both Christian and Buddhist, that the American Nation must find peaceful means of solving the problems of the Far East. They want only the military to go home, not our Peace Corps, not our students, our missionaries, our technicians, or our businessmen. If we can provide them with economic and technical assistance to meet the problem of population pressure on inadequate resources, they feel that they can meet the Communist challenge even though they might have to compromise on some form of cooperative economy. They are not as absorbed with communism as we Americans seem to be and while the peoples of Vietnam, Thailand, Cambodia, and Burma

fear the Chinese it is not so much because of Chinese communism and its proselytizing fervor as for historic reasons that go back to the times China dominated that area of the world.

These natural historic differences, however, become muted in the face of American military intervention. They cannot see this intervention in a benign light. It is merely another instance of white imperialism and tends to make them identify with Ho Chi Minh and even with Mao Tze Tung. The charity we bring with one hand is overshadowed by the big stick we carry in the other. I shall not soon forget a burnt container in a village 30 miles from Saigon. It bore the legend: "A gift to the people of Vietnam from the people of America." It was among the rubble left from American shelling of a communication artery of the Vietcong. The artery, unhappily, was inhabited by Vietnamese.

One of the most rewarding interviews we had was with the Buddhist monk, Thich Nhat Hanh, a charismatic figure who wrote a masterful letter: "In search of the enemy of man" to Martin Luther King. The fact that we had a representative from King in our committee gave us great prestige and opened many doors to us. Thich Hanh was grateful to our mission for giving a demonstration that religion could become involved politically without losing its integrity. The burning of the monks was a form of spiritual concern—a token of one's deep suffering for our human sins. He agreed that the time was at hand for Buddhists to become concerned with external changes so that the plane of higher striving might not become obscure. He recognized that communism was an evil, but war was even a greater evil, and he could not understand how justice could be established on the dead body of peace. Buddhism carries great spiritual reserves which if ever tapped for social change could make a far more profound and benign revolution than any Marx ever advocated.

Let me also share with you the searing experience I had in my visit with the Hibakusha (the survivors) of the Hiroshima bomb. They work in their various ways for peace. There are literally dozens of peace movements in Japan, unhappily divided among themselves. The group we met with are pure devotees of peace. They make paper cranes (the symbol of peace) and give them to those who will accept them in the hope that man will not repeat the great sin of Hiroshima. As one of the survivors placed a wreath of paper cranes about my neck, she said:

"Please tell the people of America that we hold no ill feelings in our heart toward them. We are not so blinded as to believe that our country would not have used the bomb if we had possessed it. But do tell them that they can save those of our friends who died from the mean oblivion of futility by outlawing nuclear war and every other kind of war. Help us convert these scars and these deaths into the substance of peace."

We went away with the feeling that our generation stands under the shadow of the Deuteronomic choice: "See, I set before thee life and death. Choose life."

I end this letter with the statement I gave to the Japanese press after a meeting with the Japan Christian Council for Peace in Vietnam.

We share with many Japanese the religious conviction that war is more than a mistaken strategy. It is an act of blasphemy, and in the very shadow of Hiroshima and Nagasaki it is clearer to us than ever that it is the anti-Christ, the destroyer of the root, the betrayal of all that has made us human. We are convinced that whatever else may survive the war toward which our present policy seems directed, faith in God and man will not survive.

We of the church and synagogue, and you of the shrine and temple, must remind each other of our shameful bending of the knee to Moloch in the past wars of our century, and strengthen each other in the sacred resolve to hold ourselves loyal to God and His creatures whatever comes.

Sincerely,

RABBI JACOB J. WEINSTEIN,
President.

REPORT FROM VIETNAM

The report of the clergymen's committee to Vietnam follows:

Pope Pius XII, 1939: "No good can come from war."

Buddhist leader, in Vietnam, 1965: "No good can come from this war."

We have visited Vietnam.

We have met with leaders of many religious faiths and established relationships which we hope will be enduring and will improve understanding and cooperation among us. We have talked also with students, soldiers, news correspondents, young volunteer workers, labor union leaders, teachers, officials of the United States and South Vietnam Governments, defectors from the Vietcong, neutralists, and supporters of North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front, political arm of the Vietcong. We have visited in Saigon and in the provinces and have walked the streets of towns and hamlets within the sound and sight of gunfire and still actively contested by the combatants.

We have found a deeply complicated situation in which we could not judge either side to be wholly right or wholly wrong. We have received differing sets of data relative to each side, and these seem to be irreconcilable in the midst of war. Whatever the origins of the war, rooted in violations of the 1954 Geneva Accords and other historical developments, both sides are now trapped by their own interpretations of these developments.

We have been moved and impressed by the courage and conviction of participants in the war on both sides, even as we have shared outrage at the violence and terror that, in varying degrees, have become the tactics of each. We have been moved too by the passionate and repeated expressions of concern by persons on both sides that the war must be brought to an end. We could find no indication of an early end to the war through military victory of either side.

Americans must realize what the agonies of the Vietnamese people have been during the past 25 years of war. We contemplate with abhorrence the prospect of the continuation of that war, to say nothing of its escalation. We do not equate peace with the simple absence of military conflict; true peace is inseparable from justice. We recognize that there are issues in Vietnam of justice, freedom, and the need for social change, but we deplore the way in which major powers have used and are using the villages of Vietnam as a testing ground for ideological positions such as "wars of national liberation" or "containment of communism by military force."

For millions of Vietnamese, war has become a way of life. Human existence is degraded and brutalized on both sides of the conflict. These, rather than the abstract moving of impersonal political forces, are the consequences of the assumption that communism can be contained or social improvement achieved primarily by military means.

The United States does not face as its only choice the moral dilemma of whether to escalate the war or to withdraw its troops unilaterally from South Vietnam. It does face the moral choice of whether to persist in its present military policy or to take every possible step to initiate negotiation and to broaden the base of decision and action to include all other nations whose welfare is involved in what transpires there. The first

19148

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 10, 1965

such step is to stop the bombing of North Vietnam as a demonstration of good faith in calling for a cease-fire.

With most Americans, we wish that this whole conflict could be referred to the United Nations for settlement. The U.N. should be asked to intervene, but its capacity to act is severely limited by the absence from its membership of North and South Vietnam and the People's Republic of China. Even so, we urge that it be asked to convene a conference on Vietnam, in which those nations and all other parties to the conflict will be included. No permanent peace or political settlement is possible without their participation.

The negotiations of such a conference must seek to reconcile the interests of the National Liberation Front and the Government of South Vietnam and arrange for the possible independence or reunification of South and North Vietnam as they may determine, with adequate international guarantees against outside military or political intervention. The negotiations must encompass consideration of the inclusion of other southeast Asian nations under such guarantees, make provision for the resumption of trade and exchange between the two Vietnams, arrange for the withdrawal of all foreign troops at an agreed upon time, and provide maximum guarantees of freedom of conscience and religious practice.

The achievement of a cease-fire and the setting up of peacekeeping machinery are only the prolog to the great work of healing and international cooperation that must follow. Large-scale programs like the Mekong River development project and small-scale person-to-person and group-to-group projects, both governmental and nongovernmental, are natural steps in this direction. Such programs should be increasingly international in conception and direction and on invitation from the recipient country, with personnel grounded in the language and customs of the people with whom they will work as equal partners in a common enterprise.

Creation of a peaceful world requires acceptance of the principle of common responsibility and interdependence in the family of nations. War must be totally rejected, but it is not enough to seek peace; we must discover nonmilitary forms of active involvement in the struggle for justice as well.

We have lived too long within the traditional concepts of nation against nation, ideology against ideology, race against race. Today we see the true enemies of man to be what they have always been: injustice, poverty, disease, national pride, the abuse of power, and the hatred and war that are their creatures and creators. To be complacent about these is to deny humanity itself. To focus our attack on these evils rather than to fight within the family of man is to stand with the god of history.

We wish to express our appreciation for the courtesy and cooperation extended us by the South Vietnam and United States authorities throughout the trip.

PARTICIPANTS IN PROJECT

The following is the list of participants in the Vietnam project, with titles and associations included for purposes of identification only:

Dr. Harold A. Bosley, minister, Christ (Methodist) Church, New York City; former dean, Duke University Divinity School.

Rt. Rev. William Crittenden, bishop of Erie, Pa.; chairman, Peace Advisory Committee of the Executive Council of the Episcopal Church; vice president, National Council of Churches.

Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, minister in residence, Crozer Theological Seminary; former president, American Baptist Convention and National Council of Churches.

Dr. Dana McLean Greeley, president, Unitarian-Universalist Association of America. Alfred Hassler, executive secretary, Fellowship of Reconciliation; vice president, International Confederation for Disarmament and Peace.

Miss Elmira Kendricks, president, National Student Christian Federation.

The Reverend James M. Lawson, minister, Centenary Methodist Church, Memphis.

Rt. Rev. Edward Murray, pastor, Sacred Heart Parish, Roslindale, Mass.; consultant, Archdiocese of Boston.

Dr. Howard Schomer, president, Chicago Theological Seminary.

(Mrs. Howard) Elsie Schomer, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

Rev. (Mrs.) Annales Stewart, former president and current Washington director, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

Rabbi Jacob Weinstein, rabbi, K.A.M. Temple, Chicago; president, Central Conference of American Rabbis.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATES

Pastor Martin Niemöller, copresident, World Council of Churches, Wiesbaden, Germany.

Pasteur Andre Trocme, St. Gervais Reformed Church, Geneva, Switzerland.

APPLAUSE FOR DR. O'BRIEN

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, for the last 5 years one man has played a very important part in securing better cooperation and understanding between the executive and legislative branches of our Government. That man, Mr. Lawrence O'Brien, the President's Special Assistant, has always maintained a high degree of loyalty to both President Kennedy and President Johnson whom he has served with distinction, and while so serving has gained great respect from Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle.

We here in the Congress are well aware of the many problems which are inherent in the smooth functioning and coordination of two major branches of Government, thus our high regard for Mr. O'Brien's efforts.

Larry O'Brien has been a man with whom all Members of Congress could feel free to discuss problems and be assured of a fair and helping hand. He has made a real contribution over the years to the Congress.

In the August 9, 1965, edition of the Washington Post, Joseph Kraft devoted his "Insight and Outlook" column to Mr. O'Brien and entitled it "Applause for Dr. O'Brien." Mr. Kraft stated that strong support that the President had received by the Congress was greatly due to the work of the President's Special Assistant for Congressional Relations, Lawrence O'Brien. Rather than constant war between the White House and the Congress, a greater degree of understanding and cooperation had developed. Kraft further stated:

Credit for this great change is normally given the President because of his long experience with the Congress, and because of the great majorities he swept in with him last fall. And certainly no one would deny or disparage the President's role.

But the strategist of the change, the man who planned it 5 years ago, and who has worked it out day by day ever since, is the President's Special Assistant for Congressional Relations, Lawrence O'Brien. While all the political assistants all over the country were writing that hate was the normal state of relations between White House and Hill, O'Brien was already beginning to develop the possibilities of cooperation.

His chief innovation was to set up in the White House a small staff charged entirely with responsibility for congressional relations. The staff was organized along the lines of the various regional and interest groups in the Senate and House. It coordinated the congressional efforts of all Government agencies. It was in constant touch with the congressional leadership. "We don't even take a headcount," one of the leaders once said, "without O'Brien."

A first gain was a far more intimate working relationship between the administration and the little known but extremely powerful giants in the House. As a supreme example, consider the case of the 1964 tax cut and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, WILBUR MILLS.

The administration, way back in 1962, proposed the tax cut to stimulate the economy; it was afraid that tying tax reform to the bill would kill the whole measure. MILLS, for his part, wanted a tax reform bill with a little cut added to smooth the way for reform.

Very slowly, month by month, by discreet little favors (a presidential visit to Arkansas) and almost invisible pressures (well-organized business testimony against reform) the administration nursed MILLS along to its point of view. The bill that finally emerged from his committee, and that he steered through the House, was almost all cut and no reform—just what Dr. O'Brien ordered.

A second gain was that the White House was in touch not only with congressional leadership, but also with the back-benchers. The 16 Agriculture Committee Democrats who supported 14(b), for example, were not the committee leaders. On the contrary, the six who opposed the administration on 14(b) were precisely the senior members of the committee.

O'Brien is at last getting some public recognition for his achievement. Indeed, the President and his friends are showering him with compliments. An educated guess is that Mr. Johnson would like him to stick around the White House job.

A good hunch is that O'Brien will leave to reenter Massachusetts politics. If nothing else the time is ripe for leavetaking. A way, a permanent way I believe, to promote cooperation between the Executive and the Congress has been worked out.

From now on the big problems will not be getting bills through the Congress. The big problem—the second phase of the Johnson administration and the true opportunity for the Republicans—will turn on the matter of applying effectively the measures that are already on the books.

I am sure that all Members of Congress recognize that Larry O'Brien has been the most effective Presidential assistant for congressional relations that we have seen.

PEACE, NOT WAR, IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a bibliography.)